



LIBRARY OF PHILLIPS ACADEMY



DOUGLAS CRAWFORD
MEMORIAL FUND

A NEW VARIORUM EDITION OF SHAKESPEARE

Founded by Horace Howard Furness (1833-1912), continued
by Horace Howard Furness, Jr. (1865-1930), and now issued
under the sponsorship of the Modern Language Association
of America.

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS, General Editor

THE SONNETS

Approved for publication by the Supervisory Committee on
the New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare:

Robert Adger Law, <i>Chairman</i>	
Joseph Q. Adams	Hazelton Spencer
Hardin Craig	George C. Taylor

Published under a grant in aid of preparation made by the
American Philosophical Society, and a grant in aid of
publication made by the Carnegie Corporation
of New York.

A NEW VARIORUM EDITION

OF

SHAKESPEARE

THE SONNETS

EDITED BY

HYDER EDWARD ROLLINS

Volume II

PHILADELPHIA & LONDON

J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY

1944

59500

Copyright, 1944, by the Modern Language Association of America

822.3
S5xV
V. 2.5

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE GEORGE BANTA PUBLISHING COMPANY

CONTENTS

APPENDIXES TO SHAKESPEARE'S SONNETS

I. THE TEXTS	I
The Text of 1609	1
The Text of 1640	18
Later History of the 1640 Text	29
Later History of the 1609 Text	36
II. THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE 1609 TEXT	42
III. THE DATE OF COMPOSITION	53
IV. THE ARRANGEMENT	74
Table Showing the Numerical Order Assigned to the Sonnets in Various Rearrangements	113
V. THE "SOURCES"	117
VI. THE QUESTION OF AUTOBIOGRAPHY: GENERAL INTERPRETATIONS	133
VII. THE DEDICATION AND MASTER W. H.	166
VIII. THE FRIEND AND MASTER W. H.	177
William Hughes (Hewes)	180
Henry Wriothesley, Third Earl of Southamp- ton	186
William Herbert, Third Earl of Pembroke	195
William Hathaway	213
William Himself	214
William Hall	216
William Hervey (Harvey)	219
Miscellaneous Theories	221
Agnostic Views	230
The Question of Homosexuality	232
The Friend a Fiction	239

IX. THE DARK WOMAN.....	242
X. THE RIVAL POET.....	277
XI. <i>WILLOBIE HIS AVISA</i>	295
XII. MUSICAL SETTINGS.....	314
XIII. THE VOGUE OF THE SONNETS.....	326
Great Britain.....	326
America.....	367
Germany.....	377
France.....	388
Italy.....	392
Other Foreign Countries.....	395
XIV. GENERAL CRITICISM.....	400
LIST OF BOOKS AND ARTICLES.....	438
GENERAL INDEX TO THE COMMENTARY AND THE APPEN- DICES.....	465

APPENDIXES TO SHAKESPEARE'S
SONNETS

APPENDIX I

THE TEXTS

THE TEXT OF 1609

The first edition of the sonnets (Q) appeared in 1609. The surviving copies are almost identical except for their title-pages, four of which have the imprint of William Aspley, seven of John Wright:

[Ornament] / SHAKE-SPEARES / SONNETS. / Neuer before Imprinted. /
[Double rule] / AT LONDON / By G. Eld for T. T. and are / to be folde by
William Aspley. / 1609. /

[Ornament] / SHAKE-SPEARES / SONNETS. / Neuer before Imprinted. /
[Double rule] / AT LONDON / By G. Eld for T. T. and are / to be folde by
Iohn Wright, dwelling / at Chrifft Church gate. / 1609. /

These pages represent an identical setting of type except for the imprints. The publisher, T. T., is identified in the entry of "a Booke called Shakespeares *sonnettes*" at Stationers' Hall on May 20, 1609 (Arber, *Transcript*, 1876, III, 410), as Thomas Thorpe.

COLLIER (ed. 1843, p. 471) claimed to be the first person to direct attention to the varied imprints. The Aspley he called the "usual imprint," for he had seen Wright's name only in the Bodley-Caldecott copy. "Possibly T. T. had some reason for having . . . [the latter] cancelled, and for substituting the name of Aspley for that of Wright: the former might be better known to the ordinary buyers of such books, and . . . he [Thorpe], perhaps, did not think it necessary to append the place where his [Aspley's] business was carried on." The explanation is wide of the mark. HUDSON (ed. 1856, p. 115) is hardly more informative: "What may have been the cause or purpose of the . . . [different imprints], is not known, nor is it of any consequence." But it is of considerable consequence. The Wright title was not canceled. Instead, LEE (*Life*, 1898, p. 90) explains, "Thorpe employed George Eld to print the manuscript, and two booksellers, William Aspley and John Wright, to distribute it to the public. On half the edition Aspley's name figured as that of the seller, and on the other half that of Wright."¹ W. C. HAZLITT (*Shakespear*, 1902, p. 190) comments: "Thorpe . . . placed his venture in the hands of [two] others for disposal concurrently; he was the middleman, who did not take the money over the counter." BARTLETT's idea is (*Mr. William Sh.*, 1922, p. 11): "Evidently the edition was divided between two booksellers and each had his copies marked with his name."

Copies of Q with the ASPLEY IMPRINT are preserved in

(1) The British Museum (Grenville 11181; facsimile by J. CAPE, 1925, with

¹ In his 1905 edition, p. 31, LEE somewhat more cautiously says, "The even distribution of the two names [Wright and Aspley] on the extant copies suggests that the edition was precisely halved between the two."

a note [see *T. L. S.*, December 3, 1925, p. 831] by A. T. B[ARTHOLOMEW]., and by BUTLER [ed. 1927]).

(2) The Bodleian Library (Malone 34; collotype facsimile by LEE [ed. 1905]). I refer to this copy elsewhere as the Bodley-Malone.

(3) The Huntington Library (Chalmers-Bridgewater; photozincographic facsimile by LOVELL REEVE and COMPANY, London, 1862¹).

(4) The Folger Sh. Library (Jolley-Uttersen-Tite-Locker-Lampson). The genuineness of its title-page and dedication leaf, though vouched for by LOCKER-LAMPSON and by authorities, including A. W. POLLARD, at the British Museum, is said by the Folger staff to be open to suspicion.

Copies of Q with the WRIGHT IMPRINT are preserved in

(5) The Bodleian Library (Caldecott, Malone 886). I refer to this copy elsewhere as the Bodley-Caldecott.

(6) The British Museum (B. H. Bright, C.21.C.44; photolithographic facsimile by CHARLES PRAETORIUS, *Sh.-Quarto Facsimiles*, no. 30, 1886;² collotype facsimile by NOEL DOUGLAS, London, 1926³ [reissued by PAYSON and CLARKE, New York, 1927]).

(7) The John Rylands Library (Farmer-Earl Spencer).

(8) The Elizabethan Club, Yale (Bentinck-Huth).

(9) The Huntington Library (Luttrell-Steevens-Roxburghe-Daniel-Griswold-Church).

(10) The Folger Sh. Library (Sir Henry St. John Mildmay).

(11) A. S. W. Rosenbach's private library (Lord Caledon).

Copies of Q with missing title-pages are preserved in

(12) The Trinity College, Cambridge, Library. This lacks sigs. A₁, A₂, B₁, K₂-L₂, which are supplied in Capell's hand, the title-page being given a WRIGHT IMPRINT.

(13) The Harvard University Library (W. A. White) with an ASPLEY IMPRINT title and a dedication page supplied in facsimile.

The text in the present volume is reprinted from the Huntington-Steevens copy (no. 9, above), with which all the other twelve have been collated.⁴

¹ J. T. WINTERICH (Sh.'s *Sonnets*, 1941, pp. [ix f.]) says that in this 1862 facsimile Q "was certainly among the first books, perhaps the very first book, to be given to the world in a direct and visual copy."

² Praetorius's facsimile is, if his note on p. xxxiii be considered, more accurate than many other reproductions in the series, though an occasional hyphen (as in *two-fold*, 41.12, and *toung-tide*, 140.2) and occasional commas (as after *waite*, 58.13, *seeke*, 67.7, *exprest*, 106.7, *render*, 125.12) are omitted, while at 32.11 *his* appears as *bis*, at 46.12 *the* as *he*, at 54.1 *beautious* as *beantious*, at 84.6 *his* as *hls*. There are a few other trifling errors.

³ The Douglas facsimile has a few errors, like the omitted apostrophe in *lou st* (10.4) and *lou d* (50.8).

⁴ JAGGARD (*Sh. Bibliography*, 1911, p. 452) lists two copies of Q in Trinity College, Cambridge, and one in the Cambridge Public Library, but the former collection has only one, the latter none. BARTLETT (*Library*, September, 1935, p. 169) mistakenly credits the New York Public Library with a copy.

A number of scholars have observed in the title and dedication pages evidence indicating unauthorized publication. Thus COLLIER (ed. 1843, p. 472), noting the publisher's initials on both, remarked that "sometimes . . . if it were suspected that a work might contain anything publicly or personally objectionable, the printer or the stationer only allowed their [*sic*] initials to appear in connection with it," but this is an inappropriate suggestion about Q. LEE (ed. 1905, p. 34) concluded that "the exceptionally brusque and commercial description of the poems, both in the entry . . . in the Stationers' Company Register, and on the title-page, as 'Shakespeares Sonnets' (instead of 'Sonnets by William Shakespeare'), is good evidence that the author was no party to the transaction";¹ and that the evidence of the dedication, written and signed by the publisher, "is even more conclusive. Only when the stationer owned the copyright and controlled the publication, did he choose the patron and sign the dedication." ROBERTSON (*Problems*, 1926, pp. 208 f.) explained "the title 'Shakespeare's Sonnets'" as probably having been "that of a MS. collection made by . . . [Mr. W. H.] in an album beginning with . . . [1-17]"; while BRAY (ed. 1938, pp. 2 f.) observed that Q has "the only title-page that appeared in the poet's lifetime with the bare surname," and its use here "suggests confidence in the advertising power of his name to revive public interest in a sonnet-sequence." Thorpe likewise stressed (as no author would have) the newness of his volume, "Neuer before Imprinted," a not entirely accurate description, as POOLER (ed. 1918, p. vii) notes, because two of the sonnets, 138 and 144, had already appeared in the *P. P.* of 1599.

Q offers a striking contrast to *Venus* and *Lucrece*, both of which lack the name of the author on the title-page but have dedications written and signed in full by him. That he signed himself there as "William Shakespeare," whereas on Thorpe's title his name is hyphenated, has seemed to various misguided individuals a highly significant fact pointing to a differentiation in the authorship of poems and sonnets.²

I have not seen the facsimile of 1850 (mentioned by Jaggard, p. 453) and do not know what copy it follows. J. R. SMITH issued a type facsimile of an Aspley imprint copy at London in 1870, apparently following the 1862 Lovell Reeve facsimile. A manuscript (now in the Folger Sh. Library) called *Songs and Sonnets by William Sh.*, designed, engrossed, illuminated, painted, and bound—a five years' task—by ALBERTO SANGORSKI, of London, is described in the *T. L. S.*, December 23, 1926, p. 952. It contains, however, only six sonnets (33, 37, 75, 91, 98, 154).

¹ An exact parallel is "*Brittons Bowre of Delights*. . . By N. B. Gent.," 1591, 1597, of which the alleged author said (*Pilgrimage to Paradise*, 1592), "I protest it was donne altogether without my consent or knowledge, & many thinges of other mens mingled with few of mine."

² H. B. SIMPSON (*Nineteenth Century*, 1917, LXXXII, 1249) asserts that all Sh.'s published works had the spelling "Shakespeare" or "Shake-speare" except *Love's Labor's Lost*, 1598 ("Shakespere") and a 1608 edition of *King Lear* ("Shak-speare"). A glance at the titles as given in BARTLETT and POLLARD's *Census*, 1916, shows that on the quartos of the plays Sh.'s name often appears as "Shake-speare."

The text of Q includes sigs. [A2], B-K⁴, L². At the top of B₁ is an ornament¹ followed by the heading "SHAKE-SPEARES, / SONNETS." The text of the one hundred fifty-four sonnets runs from B₁ to K₁, and in the middle of K₁ is the word "FINIS." followed by the signature mark "K" and the catchword "A". On K₁^v is the title "A Louers complaint. / BY / WILLIAM SHAKE-SPEARE." The text of this poem² fills K₁^v-L₂^v, and at the foot of L₂^v is "FINIS." followed by a short double row of type ornaments. The running title is "SONNETS." on the rectos of B₂-K₁, "SHAKE-SPEARES," on C₂^v, "SHAKE-SPEARES." on the versos of D₁-D₄, G₁-G₄, "SHAKE-SPEARES" on the other versos up to I₄^v. In the remainder of the volume it is "A LOVERS" on the versos of K₂-K₄, L₁, "THE LOVERS" on L₂^v, "COMPLAINT" on the recto of K₂, "COMPLAINT." on the rectos of K₃,³ K₄, L₁, L₂.

Certain mechanical errors in all copies of Q are enumerated by LEE (ed. 1905, p. 47): the initial *W* of 79.1 "is from a wrong fount," and nine catchwords are incorrect,—*To* for *Thou* (C₃), *Eternall* for *Eternal* (C₄^v), *Crawls* for *Crawles* (E₁), and on D₂, E₃, F₁^v, G₂^v, H₃^v, I₂, *Mine*, *That*, *I grant*, *When*, *My*, and *Loue* instead of the numerals 46, 70, 82, 106, 130, 142, "which are the headings respectively of the next pages (the numeral is given correctly in like circumstances in seven other places)." He failed to see many other irregularities of the same sort. For example, the catchword is "10." instead of "10" on B₂^v; as for sonnet numbers, 1 is omitted, 9, 18, and 122 are, unlike all the others, followed by periods. In violation of the usual scheme of signing only the first three leaves of each gathering, B₄ and K₄ are also signed, while K₁ is signed in much larger type than is used elsewhere. For the initial capitals in first lines two fonts of roman are indiscriminately used, one filling two full lines of type, the other shorter and smaller. The initial *W* of 79.1 mentioned by Lee and of 138.1 (which he overlooked) is of still another and an italic font. The second letter of the first line is ordinarily a small capital of the same size used throughout the verses, and the third a lower-case letter, but this practise is changed in *Thy* (31.1), *Sweet* (56.1), and *Ths* (121.1). Further irregular capitalization may be seen in *NOe Longer* (71.1), *Then If* (80.13), *Made In* (129.9), while 14.13 f. and 131.14 are not indented, and 97.3 is, contrary to custom elsewhere, indented so as to align with the second (capital) letter of 97.1 and the initial capital of 97.2.⁴ To insist, however, that all these things are errors, or misprints, is to impose standards of uniformity in "style" that were almost completely unknown to Elizabethan authors, proofreaders, and printers, and that are very commonly ignored today. In another connection LEE (*Life*, 1898, p. 419) himself admits that "typography at the time followed no firmly fixed rules."

¹ VON MAUNTZ (Sh.'s *Gedichte*, 1894, p. 148) sees strange animals in the ornament, from which he concludes that the Lucy-poacher story was already during Sh.'s lifetime "widely known"; and (pp. 152 f.) in the ornament on B₁ two "coupling woodcocks," which, being at the head of the "procreation sonnets," represent "not a bad joke for a seventeenth-century bookdealer." These visions deserve whatever immortality a foot-note can confer.

² For which see Sh.'s *Poems*, 1938.

³ A few copies apparently have "COMPLAINT" on K₃.

⁴ The irregular indention here mentioned and that at 12.12 are ignored in my reprint.

A number of small variations may be found among the thirteen extant copies of Q. The catchword at F₃ appears correctly as *Speake* only in the Huntington-Steevens and Bodley-Malone copies, incorrectly as *The* in all others. At 27.6 the British Museum-Bright copy has a semicolon, not a comma, after *thee*; at 47.10 apparently the Rosenbach copy has the spelling *selfe*, all other copies *seife*; at 76.4, 8 the question marks are not impressed in the Folger-Locker copy; at 89.11 the Folger-Mildmay and the Elizabethan Club texts read *proface*, while the rest have *prophane*; the number of sonnet 116, elsewhere appearing as 119, is correct in the Bodley-Caldecott copy; at 150.6 the Trinity College copy has a semicolon, not a comma, after *deeds*. I have observed no other variants.¹ Of two that have been specified one certainly does not occur. The CAMBRIDGE EDITORS (ed. 1893), ALDEN (ed. 1916), BROOKE (ed. 1936), and others say that the Huntington-Bridgewater copy has at 78.6 the unique reading *flee* for *flie*, but the statement is an error based upon the 1862 Lovell Reeve or the 1870 J. R. Smith type facsimile, and this particular copy reads *flie* like all the others. BROOKE remarks that some copies read *ieallous* at 57.9. The photostats at my disposal leave it uncertain whether the good old spelling *iealious* was thus changed.

THOMAS THORPE's activities have been summarized by LEE (ed. 1905, pp. 29-31). A native of Barnet, Middlesex, he was apprenticed for nine years in 1584 to Richard Watkins, and "nearly ten years later he took up the freedom of the Stationers' Company." In 1600 he secured a manuscript of Marlowe's translation of the first book of Lucan's *Pharsalia*, and, arranging for its publication, dedicated it to a fellow-stationer, Edward Blount. His name appeared on the title-page of two pamphlets in 1603, and "thenceforth for a dozen years his name reappeared annually on one, two, or three volumes. After 1614 his operations were few and far between, and they ceased altogether in 1624."² Before that time he had been "associated with the publication of twenty-nine volumes in all. . . . He never enjoyed in permanence the profits or dignity of printing his 'copy' at a press of his own, or selling books on premises of his own." In contrast (pp. 32-34), his printer GEORGE ELD and his bookseller WILLIAM ASPLEY "were in well-established positions in the trade." Eld published, among other things, *The Puritan* "by W. S.," a play in the Sh. apocrypha. Aspley, later Master of the Stationers' Company, was one of the two publishers of the 1600 quartos of *2 Henry IV* and *Much Ado*. In 1623 he became a member of the syndicate that printed the First Folio, "and he lived long enough to be a member of the new syndicate which was formed in 1632 to publish the Second Folio." JOHN WRIGHT, though con-

¹ In the Rosenbach copy *refigur'd* (6.10) lacks its apostrophe, and the *C* of *Curral* (130.2) is scarcely impressed. The *r* is apparently dropped out of *Charter* (or badly inked) at 87.3 in several copies, but in others a trace of it appears; the same is true of the *d* of *stand* (104.11) in a few; while the comma after *husband* (93.2) is not impressed in several copies. It is impossible to tell whether the mark after *prooue* at 136.7 in all copies is a period or a comma.

² See also FARR, *Library*, March, 1923, p. 251. Among Thorpe's publications were Jonson's *Sejanus*, 1605, and *Volpone*, 1607.

cerned mainly with ballads and chapbooks, occasionally printed a play—like Marlowe's *Faustus* in 1611—and in 1626 he became coowner of the rights to Sh.'s *Venus*.

As to the reliability of the 1609 text opinions widely vary. KNIGHT (ed. 1841, p. 126) was the first editor to go into details. When the book appeared, he theorized, Sh., aged forty-five, was living with his family in Stratford, and "he was naturally desirous to associate with himself all those circumstances which constitute respectability of character." How, then, *could* he authorize the publishing of Q, especially if the friend and the dark woman were real people? Sh., Knight concluded, did not sanction or superintend the publication of Q, which "although, taken as a whole, not very inaccurate, is full of those typographical errors which invariably occur when a manuscript is put into the hands of a printer to deal with it as he pleases, without reference to the author, or to any competent editor, upon any doubtful points. . . . The manuscript, in all probability, was made up of a copy of copies. . . . The separate poems were printed from different manuscripts in which various systems of writing were employed,—some using abbreviations, some rejecting them."

COLLIER (ed. 1843, p. 476) satisfied himself with calling Q "a well printed volume," though not so well printed as *Venus* or *Lucrece*. HUDSON (ed. 1856, p. 121), as usual, echoed the opinions of Knight and Collier, asserting that there is no reason to think of Q as having been "made under the supervision or with the sanction of the Poet." The evidence was interpreted differently by PALGRAVE (ed. 1865, p. 239), who made the surprising assertion that the quarto's "comparative freedom from typographical misreadings is the single point whence it might be conjectured that Shakspeare was in any way connected with the publication." RICHARD SIMPSON (*Introduction*, 1868, p. 36) said that Q, "though it carries no positive evidence of being issued under the author's superintendence, yet on the other hand bears none of the marks of surreptitious and unauthorized publication. . . . The printing is exceptionally correct for the time." STAUNTON, later to be stigmatized by BEECHING (ed. 1904, p. viii) as "the worst of all the nineteenth-century editors of Shakespeare's text," found (*Athenaeum*, January 3, 1874, p. 20) that "the Sonnets carry all the appearance of having been put in type from copy much damaged, and in many places illegible. This would be the natural condition of writings which had been copied and re-copied for a dozen years, as we know these were, perhaps by a hundred scribes, for distribution among the author's private friends. At the same time, they do not appear to have been sent to press without examination by a qualified person." Acting on this belief, he indulged in a series of conjectural readings (see I, 113, 177) that won the acceptance of BUTLER (ed. 1899) and DOUGLAS (*True History*, 1933), while arousing the distaste of Beeching.

DOWDEN's opinion (ed. 1881, p. 13) that Q "had, there is reason to believe, neither the superintendence nor the consent of the author," and that, "though not carelessly printed, [it] is far less accurate than *Venus*" is one held and expressed by various scholars today. SHINDLER (*G. M.*, 1892, CCLXXII, 74) considered the book a piratical publication: it "is very carelessly printed, the punctuation is very irregular, and the bad spelling goes beyond even the large limits of Elizabethan license." Influenced by Staunton, BUTLER (ed. 1899,

p. 2) described Q as "very carelessly printed, and though it has infinite claims on our gratitude, it has none upon our respect."

After more than a century of editorial and critical abuse, Thorpe's compositor and proofreader found a sturdy defender in WYNDHAM (ed. 1898, pp. 259-269), whose study, the most detailed up to its date, upheld the text in nearly all particulars and tried to establish Sh.'s own responsibility for it. One of his points is that every word printed in italics in Q, except *Rose* (1.2), *Hews* (20.7), *Informer* (125.13), and the *Wills* (135, 136, 143), is either a proper noun or else of Greek or Latin extraction.¹ The latter were put in italics, "as French words are so printed now, . . . because they were but partially incorporated into the English language. . . . This destroys the presumption of accident and creates a presumption of design. . . . '*Informer*' is clearly a personal apostrophe; '*Will*,' as clearly embodies a play on the poet's name" or on his friend's. *Rose*, italicized, "stands here poetically for the *Idea* or Eternal Type of Beauty, or, at least, for the emblem of that idea." Of *Hews*, "if its capital and italics be a freak of the printer, they constitute the only freak of that kind in the whole edition of 1609. This goes far to show that the Quarto was not carelessly issued," to disprove "that it was a pirated edition published without Shakespeare's knowledge or against his wishes." The use of capitals, too, is "with scarce an exception . . . rational and not arbitrary." It includes: (1) personal appellations; (2) foreign words, often borrowed from Greek or Latin, as terms of art; (3) titles of dignity; (4) names of the greater divisions of time, of cosmical processes, luminaries, and larger features of the universe; (5) personifications; (6) names of arts and sciences; (7) names of animals and plants used emblematically, proverbially, or typically. "Every word in the Quarto printed with a capital, which does not depend on punctuation, is thus susceptible of rational explanation" except for *Commend* (69.4) and *Well* (154.9), which "may or may not be misprints." "The Quarto may therefore be accepted on this count as an edition carefully revised and corrected." Equally good is the punctuation, though, of course, it not only marks syntax, as now, but also is frequently inserted "to point rhythmical or rhetorical pauses. . . . In many instances the punctuation is so exquisitely adapted to the sense, rhetoric, and rhythm of the phrase as to confirm my plea for the authority of the text." Incidentally it exhibits the structure of the sonnets. The commas are used methodically to "point the syntax . . . and often . . . [to] mark the end of a line or the major pause after the fourth or the sixth syllable, and this even when the sense demands no stop." Unvaryingly they coincide "with pauses, whether of grammar, rhythm, or rhetoric." Furthermore, the apostrophe is scrupulously employed "whenever a syllable is not to be sounded." To be sure, WYNDHAM acknowledges the presence of "three undoubted corruptions of the text"—in 34.10, 12, in 146.2, and in "the occasional confusion of *their* with *thy*"—and "three suspicious features"—the lack of rime in 25.9, 11, the couplet ending repeated in 36 and 96, the parentheses after 126.12.² "There

¹ From these four words J. M. (*Recantation*, 1909, p. [3]) gets the illuminating cryptogram, "Rose He, W. S., Informer Will."

² On these parentheses, considered by many scholars as definite proof that Sh. had nothing to do with the printed text, see the notes to 126.12.

are also some half-dozen of trifling misprints,"¹ but these can be paralleled in the text of *Venus*, "the authority of which has never been challenged." But "the number of undoubted corruptions is so small as to be negligible."

Wyndham credits Sh. with more linguistic knowledge and interest than he could have possessed—and with far more concern about consistency in "style" than 999 modern writers out of 1000 manifest today. Sh. was the supreme creative artist: it is hard to believe that he pinned his mind on commas, apostrophes, capitals, and italics. Elizabethan authors (like contemporary authors) in general left some agent of the printer or publisher to struggle with mechanical details.

Wyndham made few converts. One of them, W. B. BROWN (*N. & Q.*, January 25, 1913, p. 76; see also March 29, pp. 241–243), declares, "Mr. Wyndham has shown that the capitals and italics in the sonnets are never due to chance." Another, J. D. WILSON (*R. E. S.*, 1925, I, 356–358), attacks a present-day editor for contradicting Wyndham while adding nothing of value to the text. But, in general, it may be said that Wyndham's defense has met with almost unanimous skepticism.² Thus BEECHING (ed. 1904, pp. lix f.) saw no merit in it: "To suggest the conclusion that the poet himself saw the sonnets through the press it is not sufficient to show, as Mr. Wyndham does, that occasionally the punctuation is admirable, because in such cases the printer may have followed the manuscript before him; it is necessary also to show that in no, or very few, cases is the punctuation unintelligent or absurd. Such cases, as a matter of fact, are not infrequent, and they are not all explicable on Mr. Wyndham's theory that the stop marks a rhythmical pause rather than a syntactical division" (as in 16.10, 39.7 f., 55.7 f., 99.2–5, 113.13, 117.10, 118.9 f., 126.7 f.). As to "the occasional confusion of *their* with *thy*" "'occasional' is not the epithet I should have chosen for a confusion that occurs . . . fifteen times . . . ; and of itself this fact is enough to convince one that the poet himself did not read the proof sheets, because, although in manuscript the contracted forms look much alike, the words do not look at all alike in print. Mr. Wyndham alters thirteen of these fifteen places, defending the Quarto reading only in 35.8 and 37.7." As for italics (p. xliii), in 104 *autumn* is italicized, *spring* and *winter* printed in roman type.³ Beeching observed

¹ Among them he names *Reserne* at 85.3, having been misled by the PRAETORIUS facsimile. But in a preliminary note (p. xxxiii) the reader is warned that the British Museum copy Praetorius followed has *Reserue* (with a broken *u*).

² VAN DAM (*William Sh.*, 1900, pp. 322 f.), however, asserted that Q was printed from Sh.'s own manuscript, though "somewhat less carefully" than *Venus* and *Lucrece*; HENRY (*Sonnets de Sh.*, 1900, p. ii), that Sh. looked favorably on Q "if, indeed, he did not secretly encourage it."

³ LEE (ed. 1905, pp. 48 f. n.) disposes of the idea that Q uses italics on any consistent plan. Thus *rose* is italicized at 1.2 but not at 54.3, 6, 11, 67.8, 95.2, 98.10, and elsewhere; *alchemy* is in italics at 114.4, in roman at 33.4; *audit* is in italics at 4.12 and 126.11, in roman at 49.4; *autumn* is italicized at 104.5 but not at 97.6. *Orient* (7.1), *phoenix* (19.4), *ocean* (64.5), *epitaph* (81.1), *rhetoric* (82.10), *cherubins* (114.6) are among "words of like class to

(pp. lxi-lxiii) that Wyndham retains and defends misprints of the Q text in a number of other cases but "not . . . with success." At any rate "the blunders in words and punctuation are sufficient by themselves to prove that Shakespeare did not see his book of sonnets through the press," whereas we are sure, from their correctness, that he did "certainly put to press" both *Venus* and *Lucrece*. Hence, "we must reject the theory that he was responsible for the publication" of Q. But, writing in the same year as Beeching, CREIGHTON (*Sh.'s Story*, 1904, pp. 17, 19) swears by Q. Sh., he says, "prepared his Sonnets for the press and had them published in 1609, probably among the last things he did before he left London"; "how can any one maintain that . . . [Q] had not been prepared for the press by the author himself?"

LEE (ed. 1905, pp. 40 f.) went as far in attacking Q as Wyndham had gone in supporting it: "Thorpe had no means of access to the author's MS. The procurer of the 'copy' had obviously brought together 'dispersed transcripts' of varying accuracy. Many had accumulated incoherences in their progress from pen to pen. . . . The printer followed the manuscript with ignorant fidelity. Signs of inefficient correction of the press abound, and suggest haste in composition and press-work. The book . . . [contains] forty leaves and 2,156 [*sic*] lines of verse. Yet there are probably on an average five defects per page or one in every ten lines." In the next year NEILSON (ed. 1906, p. 1170) assured his readers that "the copy was surreptitiously obtained, and the volume issued without the author's consent." BULLEN (ed. 1907, pp. 448 f.) took the middle path: "While I wholly dissent from Mr. Wyndham's view that Shakespeare authorised and superintended the publication, I cannot agree with Canon Beeching that . . . [Q] is exceptionally ill-printed. Errors there are, but they are generally of trifling import. . . . Beeching carefully notes the misprints of the early copy, but the list is not very formidable. . . . Lee . . . enlarges this list; but I am not willing to accept in every instance his views on the subject of misprints," some of which "are merely eccentricities of spelling." But to this last volume BEECHING contributed an essay on the sonnets, in the course of which (p. 372) he flatly contradicted his general editor: "[Q] is full of stupid misprints, a proof that the poet himself was not concerned in its publication." Likewise WALSH (ed. 1908, pp. 12, 31) was shocked by this

those italicized" but are printed in roman. POOLER (ed. 1918, p. xiv) agrees: "Thorpe is inconsistent in his treatment of such words. . . . Thus 'alchemy,' 'audit,' and 'autumn' occur in Q without as well as with italics; 'Phoenix,' a proper name, has none; neither has 'pyramids,' yet this . . . was incompletely naturalised, for 'pyramis' as a singular, and 'pyramises' and 'pyramides' as plurals are found in the First Folio [1623]." On the other hand MAX DEUTSCHBEIN (*Jahrbuch*, 1940, LXXVI, 172 f.) informs us that all "those italicized words that do not indicate a proper name refer to a definite person." Hence *Rose* (1.2) = Southampton, *Hews* (20.7) = Essex, *Alien* (78.3) = Chapman and his circle, *Syren* (119.1) = the dark woman, *Will* (135, 136) = Sh., *Heriticke* (124.9) and *Informer* (125.13) = Bacon. Apparently revelations and wonders will never cease. BALDENSPERGER tells me that in the italics he finds references to "additional paganism," or "disquieting interests," or "business transactions not quite sound and safe."

"unauthorised edition" and its "innumerable misprints." MACKAIL (*Lectures*, 1911, p. 194) described Q as "a very irregularly and carelessly printed volume, which is full of typographical blunders, and was not corrected in proof either by the author or by any competent reader." "It was printed," he said (p. 202), "from a rough MS. containing alterations, erasures, and in some cases alternative readings." Very likely the printer followed Sh.'s "own MS. before it had received his final revision," or else the sonnets "were collected . . . from various MS. sources, autographs or copies. There are indications . . . that the MS. before the printers was not all in the same handwriting." POLLARD (*Sh.'s Fight with the Pirates*, 1917, pp. 32 f.) temperately commented: "It is possible, perhaps probable, that Shakespeare's Sonnets were published by Thorpe in 1609 without his consent, and that he would have stopped their publication if he could." POOLER, the best modern editor of Sh.'s non-dramatic works, saw (ed. 1918, p. vii) little room for doubt in the matter: Q was apparently "issued without Shakespeare's knowledge, certainly without his supervision; misprints are unusually frequent; the punctuation often neglects both sense and rhythm; and there are other errors of more consequence which no author or competent reader could have overlooked." The repetition of 36.13 f. at 96.13 f. (p. 93) "seems to show that Shakespeare did not prepare the Sonnets for publication, as the misprints, that he did not read the proofs." TUCKER (ed. 1924, p. lxxxvi) likewise thought errors "so frequent that they are apt to shake our faith in the correctness of the text in other places where it is not . . . demonstrably wrong."

FORT (*Two Dated Sonnets*, 1924, p. 39), strangely enough, could not "remember any opinion which disparages this text." He believed it likely that the copy "was obtained directly or nearly directly from Southampton himself." A text so good could have come only (p. 41) "from a single note-book"—one that "belonged either to Southampton himself or to some friend of his who was so intimate with him and so much a lover of poetry that he had obtained a copy of all the sonnets which the Earl had ever received from Shakespeare." Again (*Time Scheme*, 1929, pp. 14 f.), "nearly, if not quite, all the errors which modern editors note in these sonnets arose either while the latter were being set up in type or while the manuscript copy of them, which Thorpe's agent secured, was being copied for the printer; and . . . the manuscript copy, from which his text was ultimately derived, must have been almost entirely free from mistakes." J. D. WILSON (*R. E. S.*, 1926, II, 353 n.) finds "it very hard to believe that the printer's copy was not closely connected with Shakespeare's original, perhaps by means of a transcript, but if so a transcript made by a single hand. If we imagine William Hall, or another, gaining access by some means to a rather disorderly collection of the sonnets in Shakespeare's own study, all difficulties would be removed." CHAMBERS (*William Sh.*, 1930, I, 559) says that the text of Q "is not a very good one. It may rest upon a fairly authoritative manuscript, but there are sufficient misprints, including misprints of punctuation not explicable upon any theory . . . of rhetorical punctuation, to make it clear that the volume cannot have been 'overseen' . . . by Shakespeare." But GEORGE (*Sh. Sonnet*, 1931, p. 166) has the opposite opinion: the text of Q "is remarkably careful and free from mistakes; it is probably based on a copy of Shakespeare's manuscript itself." DANNENBERG (*Jahr-*

buch, 1934, LXX, 43) is sure only that "a kind hand" collected the sonnets; "whether he had access to the poet's manuscripts or merely to copies of copies cannot be determined; but it is certain that many obscurities could not have arisen first in the printing." RIDLEY (ed. 1934, p. vii) dismisses the subject by saying that Q is "on the whole well printed"; while to KITTREDGE (ed. 1936, p. 1491), "though the Quarto was not, apparently, an authorized edition, and although it was carelessly printed, the text . . . is reasonably good. Numerous misprints have proved easy to correct. About a score of passages are still doubtful, but in most of these the sense is clear enough." To BRAY (ed. 1938, p. 4) "the text is on the whole a good one. There are, to be sure, many misprints and a few bad corruptions; but there seems nothing in any of them inconsistent with printing from Shakespeare's own writing or from a transcript of it." But Q was probably "published without his knowledge and consent." According to HARRISON (ed. 1938, p. 17), "the text . . . is fairly good, with a few misprints or errors. The punctuation is inconsistent. At one time it is subtle and striking, at another obviously wrong." This editor, like a few other writers (among them FRAYNE WILLIAMS, *Mr. Sh.* [1941, p. 223 n.]), misunderstanding the meaning of Heywood's language in *An Apology For Actors*, 1612 (see Sh.'s *Poems*, 1938, pp. 533-535), decided (p. 10) "that the *Sonnets* were published with Shakespeare's approval."¹ More recently SPENCER (*Art and Life*, 1940, p. 31) has described Q as "a text not very badly printed, but badly enough to absolve the author of the proofreading."

Where scholars so violently disagree, individual students may wish after a consideration of pertinent facts to decide the question for themselves. Typographical errors ought to be easy to identify and tabulate, but it is too much to expect that Shakespeareans can agree even about them. BEECHING (ed. 1904, pp. lx-lxiii), to be sure, calls attention to forty-three misprints (not including punctuation). A larger number are enumerated by LEE (ed. 1905, pp. 41-48), "at least thirty [of which] play havoc with the sense," and still others by BROOKE (ed. 1936, pp. 58-61).² One might well suppose that these three eminent authorities have left nothing further to add. In the table that follows, the names of Beeching, Lee, and Brooke are affixed only to words or phrases cited in their respective discussions of the misprints, though, of course, the first and the third make further corrections in their own texts:

- (1) leau's (*for* leaues) 5.7 (Brooke)
- (2) beautits (*for* beauties) 6.4 (Brooke)
- (3) or siluer'd (*for* all siluer'd) 12.4 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
- (4) You (*for* Your) 13.7 (Brooke)
- (5) your (*for* you?) 16.7 (Brooke)
- (6) this (Times . . . pen) (faulty parentheses) 16.10 (Brooke)
- (7) miter (*for* meter) 17.12 (Brooke)
- (8) yawes (*for* iawes) 19.3 (Brooke)
- (9) forrwes (*for* furrows) 22.3 (Brooke)

¹ On this matter see also my introduction to the Folger Sh. Library reprint of the 1612 *P. P.*, 1940, pp. xxx-xxxii.

² Brooke (p. 59) also thinks it possible that the compositor of Q did "irreparable damage" at 20.7, 85.3, and 113.14.

- (10) wit . . . wiht (*for* with . . . wit) 23.14 (Lee, Brooke)
 (11) worth . . . quite (*for* worth . . . forth *or* fight . . . quite) 25.9, 11
 (Brooke)
 (12) tottered (*for* tattered) 26.11 (Lee)¹
 (13) their (*for* thy) 26.12 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
 (14) their (*for* thy) 27.10 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
 (15) length (*for* strength) 28.14 (Lee, Brooke)
 (16) there (*for* thee) 31.8 (Lee, Brooke)
 (17) stainteh (*for* staineth) 33.14 (Brooke)
 (18) losse (*for* crosse) 34.12 (Beeching, Brooke)
 (19) their . . . their (*for* thy . . . thy) 35.8 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
 (20) their (*for* thy) 37.7 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
 (21) dost (*for* doth) 39.12 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
 (22) this (*for* thy) 40.7 (Beeching, Lee)
 (23) he (*for* she) 41.8 (Beeching, Brooke)
 (24) their (*for* thy) 43.11 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
 (25) naughts (*for* naught) 44.13 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
 (26) their (*for* thy) 45.12 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
 (27) their (*for* thy) 46.3 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
 (28) their (*for* thy) 46.8 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
 (29) their (*for* thy) 46.13 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
 (30) their (*for* thy) 46.14 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
 (31) are (*for* art) 47.10 (Brooke)
 (32) nor (*for* not *or* noe) 47.11 (Lee, Brooke)
 (33) duly (*for* dully) 50.6 (Brooke)
 (34) perfects (*for* perfectst *or* perfect) 51.10 (Beeching, Lee)
 (35) by (*for* my) 54.14 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
 (36) monument (*for* monuments) 55.1 (Brooke)
 (37) emnity (*for* enmity) 55.9 (Brooke)
 (38) As (*for* Or *or* Else) 56.13 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
 (39) To (*for* Do) 58.11 (Beeching)
 (40) chrusht (*for* crusht) 63.2 (Lee)
 (41) or (*for* of) 65.12 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
 (42) seeing (*for* seeming) 67.6 (Brooke)
 (43) sccond (*for* second) 68.7 (Brooke)
 (44) end (*for* due) 69.3 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
 (45) Their (*for* Thy) 69.5 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
 (46) solye (*for* soyle) 69.14 (Brooke)
 (47) are (*for* art) 70.1 (Brooke)
 (48) Their (*for* Thy) 70.6 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
 (49) yeeare (*for* yeare) 73.1 (Brooke)
 (50) rn'wd (*for* ruin'd) 73.4 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
 (51) fel (*for* tel) 76.7 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
 (52) blacks (*for* blancks) 77.10 (Lee)
 (53) dispode (*for* disposde) 88.1 (Lee, Brooke)
 (54) stall (*for* shall) 90.11 (Lee, Brooke)

¹ The same word occurs also in 2.4.

- (55) bitter (*for* better) 91.9 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
- (56) could (*for* cold) 94.4 (Lee)
- (57) mightst (*for* mightst) 96.11 (Lee)
- (58) Our (*for* One) 99.9 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
- (59) his (*for* her) 102.8 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
- (60) still (*for* skill) 106.12 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
- (61) now (*for* new) 108.3 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
- (62) wish (*for* with) 111.1 (Brooke)
- (63) y'are (*for* are) 112.14 (Lee, Brooke)
- (64) lack (*for* latch) 113.6 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
- (65) Lou's (*for* Loue's) 116.9 (Brooke)
- (66) our (*for* one?) 120.9 (Beeching)
- (67) Tthy (*for* Thy) 122.1 (Lee)
- (68) foles (*for* fooles) 124.13 (Brooke)
- (69) Mistersse (*for* Mistresse) 127.9 (Lee, Brooke)
- (70) eyes (*for* brows) 127.9 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
- (71) their (*for* thy) 128.11 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
- (72) their (*for* thy) 128.14 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
- (73) Made In (*for* Mad in) 129.9 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
- (74) pursut (*for* pursuit) 129.9 (Lee, Brooke)
- (75) proud and (*for* prou'd a) 129.11 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
- (76) torment (*for* torments) 132.2 (Lee)
- (77) morning (*for* mourning) 132.9 (Lee)
- (78) be lyde (*for* belyde) 140.13 (Lee, Brooke)
- (79) sugiest (*for* suggest) 144.2 (Lee)
- (80) sight (*for* side) 144.6 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
- (81) finde (*for* fiend) 144.9 (Brooke)
- (82) My sinfull earth (repetition) 146.2 (Beeching, Lee, Brooke)
- (83) eye (*for* I) 152.13 (Lee, Brooke)
- (84) eye (*for* eyes) 153.14 (Lee, Brooke)

The foregoing tabulation is impressive—though it omits the misprinted *fo* (*for fo*) at 152.14. If each one of the eighty-four entries *were* actually a misprint, nobody could seriously defend the text of Q. But a glance at the Textual Notes shows that of the eighty-four the following thirty-one are retained in at least one modern edition of 1780 or later:

- (5) your 16.7 (Kept in thirty)
- (6) this (Times . . . pen) 16.10 (Several keep the parentheses or their equivalent)
- (11) worth . . . quite 25.9, 11 (Kept in one¹)
- (12) tottered 26.11 (Kept in four)
- (15) length 28.14 (Kept in sixteen)
- (16) there 31.8 (Kept in three)
- (19) their . . . their 35.8 (Two keep one *their*)
- (20) their 37.7 (Kept in four)
- (21) dost 39.12 (Kept in four)

¹ Which, however, notes the corrupt text.

- (22) this 40.7 (Kept in five)
- (23) he 41.8 (Kept in five)
- (31) are 47.10 (Kept in three)
- (32) nor 47.11 (Kept in one)
- (33) duly 50.6 (Kept in one)
- (35) by 54.14 (Kept in nineteen)
- (36) monument 55.1 (Kept in two)
- (38) As 56.13 (Kept in one)
- (39) To 58.11 (Kept in twenty-four)
- (42) seeing 67.6 (Only three *change* it)
- (59) his 102.8 (Kept in twelve)
- (60) still 106.12 (Kept in four)
- (61) now 108.3 (Kept in twelve)
- (63) y'are 112.14 (Kept in five)
- (64) lack 113.6 (Kept in one)
- (66) our 120.9 (Changed in none)
- (70) eyes 127.9 (Kept in many, often with a change in 127.10)
- (75) proud and 129.11 (Kept in one)
- (76) torment 132.2 (Kept in nine)
- (77) morning 132.9 (Kept in one)
- (82) My sinfull earth 146.2 (Kept in five, which, however, admit a corruption)
- (83) eye 152.13 (Kept in two)

A few of the thirty-one readings just mentioned seem needlessly faithful to a corrupted text, and could hardly be supported, except quixotically, by anybody except the editors concerned. For example, to retain readings (11), (32), (33), (36), (38), (75), (82), (83) is to adopt the counsel of eccentricity—or desperation. For the others a case, sometimes an excellent case, can be made out.

It is noteworthy, however, that of the eighty-four “misprints” compiled by Beeching, Lee, and Brooke fifty-three are emended or modernized—though not always in the same way—in all the editions I have collated. They are:

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| (1) leau's 5.7 | (25) naughts 44.13 |
| (2) beautits 6.4 | (26) their 45.12 |
| (3) or 12.4 ¹ | (27-30) their 46.3, 8, 13, 14 |
| (4) You 13.7 | (34) perfects 51.10 |
| (7) miter 17.12 | (37) emnity 55.9 |
| (8) yawes 19.3 | (40) chrusht 63.2 |
| (9) forrwes 22.3 | (41) or 65.12 |
| (10) wit . . . wiht 23.14 | (43) sccond 68.7 |
| (13) their 26.12 | (44) end 69.3 |
| (14) their 27.10 | (45) Their 69.5 |
| (17) stainteh 33.14 | (46) solye 69.14 |
| (18) losse 34.12 | (47) are 70.1 |
| (24) their 43.11 | (48) Their 70.6 |

¹ Whether HARRISON's reading *o'er* indicates that he regards *or* as a misprint is not clear.

- | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------|
| (49) yeeare 73.1 | (67) TThy 122.1 |
| (50) rn'wd 73.4 | (68) foles 124.13 |
| (51) fel 76.7 | (69) Mistersse 127.9 |
| (52) blacks 77.10 | (71, 72) their 128.11, 14 |
| (53) dispode 88.1 | (73) Made In 129.9 |
| (54) stall 90.11 | (74) pursut 129.9 |
| (55) bitter 91.9 | (78) be lyde 140.13 |
| (56) could 94.4 | (79) sugiest 144.2 |
| (57) mighst 96.11 | (80) sight 144.6 |
| (58) Our 99.9 | (81) finde 144.9 |
| (62) wish 111.1 | (84) eye 153.14 |
| (65) Lou's 116.9 | |

Now fifty-three misprints in a total of 2155 lines would be a damning number even for a great poetic genius like Sh. (assuming, what almost nobody believes, that he did read the proofs) or for his printer to have overlooked. Yet the total is less impressive than it sounds. Modern, not Elizabethan, ideas of orthography have too frequently been followed in determining what a "misprint" is. A mere glance at the *N. E. D.* proves that (7) *miter*, (9) *forrwes*, (12) *tottered*, (56) *could*, (68) *foles*, (74) *pursut*, (77) *morning*, and (81) *finde* are recognized sixteenth-century and seventeenth-century spellings of *meter*, *furrows*, *tattered*, *cold*, *fools*, *pursuit*, *mourning*, and *fiend*. These spellings are no more unusual and need no more particularizing as misprints than *wragged* (6.1), *Haste* (20.2), *coopelment* (21.5), *enimes . . . ethers* (28.5), *tropheis* (31.10), *shoulld* (51.3), *iealious* (57.9), *pibled* (60.1), *shewers* (75.2), *Asconce* (110.6), *grin'de* (110.10), *misteres* (126.5), *Currall* (130.2), *femall* (144.5), *randon* (147.12), *strang* (153.8), *thether* (153.12), and others. Indeed, *could* makes not one but five appearances in the sonnets (2.14, 11.6, 73.3, 94.4, 153.4), as against one *cold* (13.12) and one *colde* (104.3). Again, (1) *leau's* is a not unusual plural form (the *N. E. D.* says that the apostrophe was "common in the nominative plural"),¹ and (65) *Lou's* is a legitimate spelling for the contracted *Love is*. Even (49) *yeeare*, (69) *mistersse*, and (79) *sugiest* need little apology: *mistersse* shows a common metathesis of *r*, *suggest* (the interchange of *i* and *j* is of no significance) is a passable spelling, and an Elizabethan would have been no more daunted by *yeeare* than by *shoulld* (51.3). Furthermore, Brooke (pp. 61-64) believes that (34) *perfects*, (40) *chrusht*, (57) *mighst*—as well as *vnstayined* (70.8) and *preuenst* (100.14), which fail to be rated as misprints in the compilation given above—represent Sh.'s own spellings, some of them consciously designed to avoid "harsh clusters of consonants."²

If the seventeen misprints just discussed be removed from the Beeching-Lee-Brooke list, thirty-six remain. Other editors, too, have discovered misprints in other words and phrases, which they emend or modernize either silently or with a note of explanation. The most important are:

- | | |
|---------------|-------------------------|
| 19.5 fleet'st | 51.11 naigh . . . flesh |
| 23.9 books | 72.3 for get |

¹ Cf. *mouth's*, *Venus*, line 695.

² He says (p. 64) that *vnstayined* marks an "elaborate diphthongization."

74.12 remembred	125.4 proues
95.12 turnes	126.2 fickle . . . sickle, hower
100.14 preuenst	135.13 no vnkinde, no
113.14 maketh mine	145.8 a new
116.8 highth	148.8 mens: no,
119.14 illls	153.8 strang

Evidently, then, a tabulation of the "misprints" in Q depends very largely on who is the tabulator.

LEE (ed. 1905, pp. 40-48), one will notice, has passed a much severer judgment on Thorpe's printer and proofreader than any other scholar. As always, he is greatly distressed by what he calls "the discrepancies in spelling" which "confirm the impression that the compositors followed an unintelligent transcript"—as *false: faulse: falce* (20.4 f., 68.14, 72.9, 92.14, 93.7). He lists "more than forty other orthographical peculiarities of like significance, few of which are distinguishable from misprints"—as *accumilate* (117.10), *binne* (117.5), *deceaued* (104.12), *dome* (145.7), *hunny* (65.5), *randon* (147.12), *Yf* (124.1). He sees a "like want of care . . . in the frequent substitution of the preposition *to* for the adverbial *too*," as in 38.3, 61.14, 74.12, 83.7, in the spelling of *too* for *to* at 135.2, and in the confusion of *were* and *weare* at 77.1, 98.11, 140.5. But the spellings in question are perfectly normal. With exactly as much justice one might take Chaucer and his scribes to task for failing to observe the orthographical standards of the twentieth century. And so GREG, reviewing Lee's edition (*Library*, April, 1906, pp. 206 f.), rightly objects to the strange persistence with which "he seeks to impose a purely arbitrary standard of orthography, to import an idea of uniformity into sixteenth-century spelling which simply did not then exist, and to stigmatize whatever will not conform to his ideas as a misprint. Many of the forms cited as errors of the press, or as 'Spelling eccentricities which are scarcely to be differentiated from misprints' were perfectly recognized, and are supported by the best authorities."¹

LEE further insists that "considerable irregularity characterizes the use of capital letters within the line or [*sic*] of italic type.² Both appear rarely and at the compositor's whim. . . . The printer . . . usually went his own way without heed of law or custom." Exactly so, the punctuation lacks "systematic care." "Commas are frequent, both in and out of place," "brackets [that is, parentheses] are occasionally used as a substitute for commas, but not regularly enough to justify a belief that they were introduced on a systematic plan," "in several places a mark of interrogation takes the place of one of exclamation with most awkward effect." In short, Q is an early seventeenth-century book printed in normal early seventeenth-century style. The last two faults—

¹ See also my discussion in Sh.'s *Poems*, 1938, pp. 370-373.

² [Among these irregularities are the italic interrogation marks at 6.12, 28.2, 61.8, 65.4, 67.6, 76.1, 8, 97.3, 119.6, and elsewhere; the italicized colons at 8.8, 21.12, 33.4, 56.11, 72.8, 88.8, 141.8, and elsewhere; and the wrong-font (italic) parentheses at 26.8, 27.11, 28.5, 29.11, 43.9, 46.6, 49.1, 50.2, and elsewhere. Except for the four italic parentheses at the end of 126, I have ignored these typographical peculiarities in my own reprint of the sonnets.]

parentheses (as in 57.6, 71.9 f., 80.11) instead of commas and a question mark (presumably as at 43.8, 10, 12, 95.3, 97.2-4) for an exclamation point—turn up in practically every other Jacobean text, as PERCY SIMPSON has shown in his *Shakespearian Punctuation*, 1911. But, although Simpson, with such writers as Lee in mind, asserts (p. 9) that "the printer of the 1609 text was at great pains to indicate the rhythm by the punctuation," he is obliged to make so many exceptions to his own rules as largely to nullify them. Thus (pp. 68 f.) of the colons in 7.12 f., 32.3 f., 39.7 f., he admits that "the sense hardly seems to justify so strong a pause," and that "the emphasizing comma" would do just as well. Rhythmical or not, the punctuation all too frequently is, in the judgment of all the modern editors,¹ impossible; as,

And patience tame, to sufferance bide each check (58.7);
 Incapable of more repleat, with you, (113.13);
 The ills that were, not grew to faults assured, (118.10);
 Had, hauing, and in quest, to haue extreame,
 A blisse in prooffe and proud and very wo, (129.10 f.).

Lee and other dispraisers of the text could have bolstered their positions if they had commented on the numerous instances of faulty punctuation after the final words of the sonnets; as,

2.14 could,	43.14 me,
16.14 skill,	62.14 daies,
18.14 thee,	75.14 away,
26.14 me	79.14 pay,
28.14 stronger	108.14 dead,
35.14 me,	117.14 loue

Just as PERCY SIMPSON holds a brief for the punctuation,² so others think that Q preserves much, or all, of Sh.'s own spelling. MARSCHALL (*Anglia*, 1927, LI, 318), though believing Q "a collection the unintentional production of which extended over many years," finds that "traces of orthographic arbitrariness are scattered more sparsely than one might expect them to be in such confidential expressions. But," he adds, "one must remember that these 154 sonnets first had to be collected and of course transcribed for the printer in a continuous manuscript." In that process uniformity in spelling may well have been brought about by the copyist, though he failed to remove youthful and inconsistent spelling in 127-154 which proves that section to have been written earlier than 1-126. It is not unlikely, TANNENBAUM (*P. Q.*, 1931, X, 393-395) asserts, that Thorpe "had the poet's own manuscript . . . for his 'copy.'" In any case, his compositor followed copy written in a secretary, not Italian, script, a fact explaining the erroneous readings at 20.7, 69.3, 129.11, and elsewhere. RENDALL's opinion is (*Sh.: Handwriting*, 1931, pp. 17 f.), "The printer worked from the author's own manuscript," and "the printed text

¹ The only exception is HARRISON (ed. 1938), who follows Q in 58.7 and 129.11 (not 129.10), but his text is eccentric throughout.

² His theory was attacked and seriously damaged by ALDEN (*P. M. L. A.*, 1924, XXXIX, 557-580), C. C. FRIES (*Michigan Studies in Sh.*, 1925, pp. 65-86), E. J. HOWARD (*S. P.*, 1930, XXVII, 220-229), and others.

reflects the characteristics of the original all the more transparently in that the sheets were certainly not corrected by the author [Oxford] or by any competent proof-reader."

These views are developed at length by BROOKE (ed. 1936, pp. 59-65), who says the spelling of Q "is marked by peculiarities which are not those of ordinary printers or of careful copyists, but may preserve idiosyncrasies of the author." Against "uncouth" heedlessness, like *hight* and *high* (32.8, 116.8), *sieth* and *syeth* (12.13, 60.12, 100.14, 123.14), and *wragged* (6.1), "stands in delectable contrast the essential fidelity of the Quarto to what we can imagine Shakespeare to have written. . . . There is little indeed in the text of 1609, except the order of the sonnets [see pp. 109 f., below], that justifies any suspicion of corruption." It is, then, hard for Brooke to imagine that the sonnets had gone "through a series of manuscript copies, or that such copies, if made by competent scribes, would have passed on to the printer so many traces of the idiosyncratic author." Hence he thinks it altogether likely that "Thorpe got his hands upon the actual copy of the Sonnets which belonged either to Shakespeare or to his friend."

Here the discussion of the merits and demerits of Q may break off until the next editions are published—tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow. After all, if each question concerning Sh. were settled to everybody's satisfaction, there would presumably be an end to books—an end to sonnet criticism and scholarship. And who, even in his most riotous imagination, can conceive of a barren age when essays, treatises, editions will fail to appear, not like Southey's epics "every spring," but every month, every week, almost every day?¹

THE TEXT OF 1640

The second appearance of the sonnets in print came some thirty years after the first. Thorpe, who owned the copyright of Q, ceased to publish in 1624 (see p. 15, above). Fifteen years later John Benson pirated Thorpe's text, but took such great pains to conceal his piracy that he has deceived many modern scholars, just as apparently he hoodwinked the wardens of the Stationers' Company. His book seems to have been published late in 1639,² and the title-page, dated 1640, runs thus:

¹ To NEILSON and HILL (ed. 1942, p. 1369) "it is manifest that the copy [for Q] was surreptitiously obtained, and the volume issued without the author's consent. The printing was very careless, but the text cannot be called a bad one." They describe as misprints such words as *miter* (17.12), *forrwes* (22.3), *trauaill* (27.2), *tenure* (61.8), *bitter* (91.9), *proud* (129.11), and hence in their own text print the modernized forms in brackets as (p. v) "readings which are due to modern conjecture." But *trauaile* (34.2) and *trauaild* (63.5) are modernized without brackets.

² DOWDEN (ed. 1881, p. 46) says, "Dr. Bliss had a leaf of this edition, with a contemporary manuscript note, showing that it was printed in 1639, and was sold bound for fifteen pence." KEYNES (*Library*, December, 1925, pp. 280 f.) discusses waste sheets of sigs. B and D of this volume which he found in the binding of a copy of Fuller's *Holy War* (Cambridge, 1639). It was registered (in part) on November 4, 1639 (see p. 23, below).

POEMS: / VVRITTEN / BY / WIL. SHAKE-SPEARE. / Gent. / — / [Device, McKerrow 283] / — / Printed at *London* by *Tho. Cotes*, and are / to be sold by *Iohn Benson*, dwelling in / *S^t. Dunstons* Church-yard. 1640. / 8°, sigs. [-]¹, *⁴, A-L⁸, M⁴. Sig. B₃ is signed B₅.

Many copies have survived. I have collated only the Harvard and two Folger copies, and have found the few variant readings given in the Textual Notes for 116.3, 12, 13. FARR (*Library*, March, 1923, pp. 252 f.) comments on "some slight variations in the few copies" examined by him. Thus the forms *compasse* and *compasse* both occur on sig. H8; and a Trinity College, Cambridge, copy, instead of the usual running title *Poëms*, has on A4 *True Admirat-ion* and on A6 *Youthfull glory*. No doubt, further variants would be brought to light by a careful examination of other copies.

The frontispiece, facing the title, LEE (ed. 1905, p. 69) observes, is "a carefully-elaborated cut of the Droeshout engraving of the First Folio signed 'W. M. Sculpsit.' [Or, rather, '*W. M. sculpsit.*'] The engraver was William Marshall, an artist of repute.¹ The lower half of the plate is occupied by eight lines of verse, of which the first six consist of three couplets drawn at haphazard from Ben Jonson's eulogy in the First Folio. The concluding couplet . . . alone seems original." They run as follows:

*This Shadowe is renowned Shakespear's? Soule of th' age
The applause? delight? the wonder of the Stage.
Nature her selfe, was proud of his designes
And joy'd to weare the dresfing of his lines;
The learned will Confess, his works are such,
As neither man, nor Muse, can prayse to much.
For ever live thy fame, the world to tell,
Thy like, no age, shall ever paralell.*

The other preliminary matter, "prepared and printed after the rest of the volume was ready for the press" (LEE), contains: sig. *1, title-page with verso blank; *2-2^v, Benson's preface; *3-4, Leonard Digges's verses on Sh. (see MUNRO, *Sh. Allusion-Book*, 1909, I, 455-458); *4^v, John Warren's verses on Sh. (the same, I, 459). On A1 is a second title-page (with its verso blank), identical with that on *1 except that the date is omitted and, in consequence, the last line of the imprint has a slightly different spacing. A2 has the heading, "[Ornament] / POEMS / BY / WILL. SHAKESPEARE / Gent.", followed by a long rule.

The printer Cotes is characterized by LEE (ed. 1905, p. 55) as "the most experienced of any in the trade in the production of Shakespearean literature. Cotes had bought in 1627 and 1630 the large interests in Shakespeare's plays which had belonged respectively to Isaac Jaggard and Thomas Pavier. He printed the Second Folio of 1632 and a new edition of *Pericles* in 1635." The publisher Benson had been admitted to the Stationers' Company in June, 1631 (Arber, *Transcript*, 1876, III, 686), and beginning on January 19, 1635, he published some half dozen books before November, 1639 (the same, 1877, IV,

¹ [For an account of his life and works, signed "MRS. ESDAILE," see the *T. L. S.*, January 30, 1937, p. 80.]

332, 373, 374, 376, 414, 439, 484; for books later than the 1640 *Poems* see IV, 493, 498, 500, 507). PLOMER (*Dictionary*, 1907, p. 22) describes him as "chiefly a publisher of ballads and broadsides." So far as the 1640 *Poems* is concerned, he was frankly a pirate. In spite of his misleading title, he did not include *Venus* and *Lucrece*; for those poems were still popular in 1639-1640, their copyrights jealously guarded. The case was different with Thorpe's sonnets and with the 1612 *P. P.*, the latter having been openly called a piratical volume by its involuntary contributor Heywood and indirectly so stigmatized by Sh. himself. What Benson did, then, was to jumble together in a new, unauthorized, and deceptive order all but eight of the sonnets (18, 19, 43, 56, 75, 76, 96, 126)—some of them with verbal changes designed to make the verses apply to a woman instead of a man¹—with the *L. C.*, the entire contents of the 1612 *P. P.*,² the *P. & T.*, and various poems by miscellaneous authors—Milton, Jonson, William Basse, Beaumont, Herrick, Thomas Carew, William Strode, Thomas Carey, William Cartwright, and others yet unidentified. The one hundred forty-six sonnets are arranged as seventy-two poems, which sometimes consist of merely one sonnet from Q, again of two, three, four, or five sonnets run together; and for each of the seventy-two "poems" a title is manufactured, so that Benson's compilation has a totally unfamiliar appearance.

The following is a rapid summary of the contents of Benson's book, arabic numerals referring to the sonnets of Q, roman to poems in the *P. P.* of 1612:³

67-69 (The glory of beautie)	20 (The Exchange)
60, 63-66 (Injurious Time)	27-29 (A disconsolation)
53, 54 (True Admiration)	VI, VII
57, 58 (The force of love)	30-32 (The benefit of Friendship)
59 (The beautie of Nature)	VIII, IX
1-3 (Loves crueltie)	38-40 (A congratulation)
13-15 (Youthfull glory)	41, 42 (Losse and gaine)
16, 17 (Good Admonition)	XI-XIII
7 (Quicke prevention)	44, 45 (Melancholy thoughts)
4-6 (Magazine of beautie)	X
8-12 (An invitation to Marriage)	33-35 (Loves Releefe)
I [= 138] (False beleefe)	36, 37 (Vnanimitie)
II [= 144] (A Temptation)	XIV
III	24 (A Master-peece)
21 (True content)	25 (Happinesse in content)
23 (A bashfull Lover)	26 (A dutifull Message)
22 (Strong conceite)	50, 51 (Goe and come quickly)
IV, V	46, 47 (Two faithfull friends)

¹ As when *him* and *he* (101.11, 14) are changed to *her* and *she*, *friend* (104.1) and *boy* (108.5) to *love*. Just so the new titles often refer to a woman (see p. 133, below).

² With the changes noted on p. 21, below.

³ For fuller details see my discussion in Sh.'s *Poems*, 1938, pp. 605-607. Here it should be mentioned that the *P. P.* of 1599 contains only poems I-XX. Benson followed the 1612 edition to which Jaggard had added XXI-XXIX, all stolen from Heywood's *Troia Britanica*, 1609.

- 48 (Carelesse neglect)
 49 (Stoute resolution)
 XV-XVIII
 62 (Sat fuisse)
 55 (A living monument)
 52 (Familiaritie breeds contempt)
 61 (Patiens Armatus)
 71, 72, 74 (A Valediction)
 70 (Nil magnis Invidia)
 80, 81 (Love-sicke)
 116 (The Picture of true love)
 82-85 (In prayse of his Love)
 86, 87 (A Resignation)
 XX
 88-91 (A request to his scornfull Love)
 92-95 (A Lovers affection though his Love prove unconstant)
 97-99 (Complaint for his Loves absence)
 100, 101 (An invocation to his Muse)
 104-106 (Constant affection)
 102, 103 (Amazement)
 109, 110 (A Lovers excuse for his long absence)
 111, 112 (A complaint)
 113-115 (Selfe flattery of her beautie)
 117-119 (Tryall of loves constancy)
 120 (A good construction of his Loves unkindenesse)
 121 (Errour in opinion)
 122 (Vpon the receit of a Table Booke from his Mistris)
 123 (A Vow)
 124 (Loves safetie)
 125 (An intreatie for her acceptance)
 128 (Vpon her playing on the Virginals)
 129 (Immoderate Lust)
 127, 130-132 (In prayse of her beautie though black)
 133, 134 (Vnkinde Abuse)
 135, 136 (A Love-Suite)
 137, 139, 140 (His heart wounded by her eye)
 141, 142 (A Protestation)
 143 (An Allusion)
 145 (Life and death)
 146 (A Consideration of death)
 147 (Immoderate Passion)
 148-150 (Loves powerfull subtilty)
 78, 79 (Retaliation)
 73, 77 (Sunne Set)
 107, 108 (A monument to Fame)
 151, 152 (Perjurie)
 XXV (by Heywood)
 153, 154 (Cupids Treacherie)

Then follow in order six poems (XXIII, XXIV, XXVI-XXIX) by Heywood; the *L. C.*; two further Heywood poems (XXI, XXII); two poems corresponding to XIX, with texts based upon a combination of those in the *P. P.* and *England's Helicon*, 1600 or 1614; "Come live with me and be my deare," an imitation (not in the *P. P.*) of XIX, from *England's Helicon*; "Take, O take those lips away" from Fletcher's *Bloody Brother* (the first of its two stanzas is also in *Measure for Measure*); the *P. & T.*; "Why should this [a] desert be" from *As You Like It*; Milton's verses on Sh. from the Sh. Second Folio of 1632; William Basse's elegy on Sh.; and an anonymous elegy on Sh. beginning, "I Dare not doe thy Memory that wrong." At this point, sig. L1^v, the *Poems* proper ends. Then comes (L2-M4), concluding the book, the "Addition" of poems, already mentioned, by miscellaneous writers.¹

¹ In Sh.'s *Poems*, 1938, p. 606, No. 115 (beginning, "I'th nonnage of a Winters day"), sig. L6^v, was not identified. C. L. DAY and E. B. MURRIE (*English Song-Books*, 1940, p. 264) list a version ascribed to Milton in Henry Lawes's *Second Book of Aires*, 1655, p. 37, and another in John Playford's *Musical*

Nobody who studies the *Poems* without preconceived opinions can fail to see that it was an illegal publication. The omission of the word *sonnets* and of the puzzling dedication to Mr. W. H., as well as the rearrangement of the sonnets and the *P. P.* poems, was a deliberate, and evidently a successful, attempt to deceive readers and to hide the theft. Perhaps a similar motive led Benson also to fabricate titles for the sonnets,¹ though, in this case, a natural desire for uniformity with the *P. P.* poems, all having titles in the 1612 edition, may be responsible. Many of these fabrications are altogether inept. A seventeenth-century owner of a copy of Benson's book that later passed to Halliwell-Phillipps and finally to the Folger Sh. Library, busied himself in revising them through sig. B7, where, perhaps, he grew disgusted. He changed the heading of 67-69 to "Beauty sullied wth inconstancy"; 60, 63-65, to "Eternity of Verse, spight of Injurious Time that destroys all things else"; 57, 58, to "Attendance & Patience in Loue"; 59, to "The search into former Ages to know o^r proficiency or deficiency"; 138, to "Mutuall flatterie"; 21, to "Beauty praisd wthout Hyperbole's"; 23, to "Dicere quae pudit, scribere iussit Amor" (from Ovid, *Heroides*, IV. 10); 22, to "Exchange of hearts"; 20, to "The M.^{ris} Masculine" (which looks significant); 27-29, to "disconsolations consoled." He detached 66 from the group 60, 63-66, giving it the title, "O Tempora! o mores! Love salues all sores," and 53 from 54, adjoining the separate headings, "Imitability & Immutability," "Chymistry of verse." More important still, he saw the incongruity of breaking up 1-17, which (like most modern readers) he thought of as variations on one theme, into six unrelated poems. Hence he scratched out Benson's titles, naming 1-3 "Motiues to procreation as y^e way to outliue Time" (thus anticipating the language of many modern Germans), and designating 13-15, 16-17, 7, 4-6, 8-12 as "On y^e same subiect," "On y^e subiect before," "On y^e same subiect," "On same subiect," "On y^e foregoing subiect." One can only regret that the ancient annotator stopped his work so soon.²

Just as revealing of Benson's chicanery as the rearrangement of the sonnets

Companion, 1673, p. 125. They also list (p. 177) No. 118 (beginning, "Aske me why I send you here"), sig. L8^v, as occurring in Thomas Carew's *Poems*, 1640, sig. N6^v.

¹ A writer in the *Athenaeum*, April 30, 1898, p. 562, asserted that sonnets were unpopular in 1640, and that Benson, in order to make his book salable, changed the order of the sonnets in Q, "combined them into groups under special titles, and named the volume not 'Sonnets,' but 'Poems.'" But "it is useless to speculate on the motives of a man who printed as part of Shakespeare's works three poems on his death," says POOLER (ed. 1918, p. x). Incidentally, the eighteenth-century editions from GILDON to EVANS retain the titles unchanged (occasional differences in hyphenation and spelling being ignored) except that *Loves* (97-99) becomes *Lovers*; *Tryall* (117-119), *A Trial*; *A Love-Suite* (135, 136), *Love Suit*. As for the later editions, OULTON and the BOSTON editions of 1807 and 1808 follow the changes just listed except that Boston² (see pp. 34 f., below) returns to the Benson reading *Love's* (97-99); in addition Oulton and Boston² change *unconstant* (92-95) to *Inconstant*.

² He changes at 3.3 Benson's misprint *repaine* to *repair*; at 54.14 *by* to *my*; at 138.9, 11 *young* and *tongue* to *trew* and *shew*. See also 66.14 n.

and other poems is the fact that no assignment, or transfer, of the copyright either of the *P. P.* or of *Q* appears in the Stationers' Register, though he did make his volume partially legal by securing a license on November 4, 1639 (Arber, *Transcript*, 1877, IV, 487), for its concluding portion: "*An Addicion of some excellent Poems to Shakespeares Poems by other gentlemen. viz^t. His mistris drawne. and her mind by Beniamin: Johnson. An Epistle to Beniamin Johnson by Ffrancis Beaumont. / His Mistris shade. by R: Herrick. &c.*"

In his preface he was intentionally misleading—almost as if, like the earlier Thorpe, he wished to give scholars in later times something to write learnedly about:

To the Reader.

I Here presume (under favour) to present to your view, some excellent and sweetely composed Poems, of Master William Shakepeare, Which in themselves appeare of the same purity, the Authour himselfe then living avouched; they had not the fortune by reason of their Infancie in his death, to have the due accomodatiō of proportionable glory, with the rest of his everliving Workes, yet the lines of themselves will afford you a more authentick approbation than my assurance any way can, to invite your allowance, in your perusall you shall finde them Seren, cleere and eligantly plaine, such gentle straines as shall recreate and not perplexe your braine,¹ no intricate or cloudy stuffe to puzzell intellect, but perfect eloquence; such as will raise your admiration to his praise: this assurance I know will not differ from your acknowledgement. And certaine I am, my opinion will be seconded by the sufficiency of these ensuing Lines; I have beene somewhat sollicitus to bring this forth to the perfect view of all men; and in so doing, glad to be serviceable for the continuance of glory to the deserved Author in these his Poems.

I. B.

Benson wrote this preface to hide his tracks. He could not very well admit that he had stolen the property of other men by reprinting most of the contents of *Q* and the *P. P.* Instead he pretends to give readers hitherto unprinted poems of the same authenticity as those, like *Venus* and *Lucrece*, Sh. had openly acknowledged during his lifetime—"of the same purity as those the author himself, then living, avouched."² He explains that because they were written late in life, the author had no time, or no inclination, to give them to the press: "they had not the fortune by reason of their infancy at the time of his death to have the due glory that has come to the rest (the published part) of his ever-living works."³ So plausible sounding are Benson's words that

¹ [MATHEW (*Image of Sh.*, 1922, pp. 112 f.) says, Benson "seems to have amused himself by writing a part of this statement in irregular Verse."]

² The verb is used with exactly the same meaning, "vouch for," "acknowledge authorship of," by the anonymous compiler of *Holborn-Drollery*, 1673, who tells "The Ladies of Quality" that its contents "have long since been in possession of publick Favour and Applause, yet I may justly say, This is the first time I durst avouch them."

³ POOLER's suggestion (ed. 1918, p. xv) about the meaning of the preface is not very different from that given above: "It may imply that Benson knew and used Thorpe's book, that he supposed it to have Shakespeare's authority,

John Warren, author of one of the two commendatory poems, did not think of doubting their truth:

W^Hat, lofty *Shakespeare*, art againe reviv'd?
 And *Virbius* like now shovv'ft thy selfe twife liv'd,
 Tis love that thus to thee is shovvne,
 The labours his, the glory still thine owne.
 These learned Poems amongst thine after-birth,
 That makes thy name immortall on the earth,
 Will make the learned still admire to see,
 The Muses gifts so fully infus'd on thee.
 Let Carping *Momus* barke and bite his fill,
 And ignorant *Davus* flight thy learned skill:
 Yet those who know the worth of thy desert,
 And with true judgement can discern thy Art,
 Will be admirers of thy high tun'd straine,
 Amongst whose number let me still remaine.

But, as CARPENTER (*Catholic World*, 1918, CVI, 506 f.) skeptically inquires: "When did the author 'then living' 'avouch' their purity? Was it purity of text or of sentiment that was thus 'avouched'? How had Benson alone managed to hear of their author . . . avouching anything about his *Sonnets* or about any other composition of his? Where, in all chronicle, is there a record of Shakespeare ever having mentioned to anybody a single one of his works . . .? And what was the 'infancy' of the *Sonnets* (they had been in print for seven years when Shakespeare died in 1616) which deprived them of their 'proportionable glory'? . . . They were in 1640—just where they were in 1609—at large; little Japhets in search of a father. Or . . . just as they were in 1609 when Thorpe took possession of them: *publici juris*—like umbrellas—anybody's for the asking!" There is, indeed, not the slightest reason to believe that Benson knew of any controversy concerning the personages of the sonnets or that he had heard of any scandal connected with them. He is, instead, merely praising his own, allegedly new, wares. The titles he supplies, as LEE (ed. 1905, p. 57) says, "make it clear that Benson did not distinguish the sonnets from amatory poems of a normal type,"—"In prayse of his Love" (82–85), "Selfe flattery of her beautie" (113–115), "Vpon the receipt of a Table Booke from his Mistris" (122), "An intreatie for her acceptance" (125). When he refers to his stolen poems as "serene, clear, and elegantly plain, such gentle strains as shall recreate and not perplex your brain, no intricate or cloudy stuff to puzzle intellect," his meaning escapes GOLLANCZ (ed. 1896, p. vi), who comments: "Mr Publisher 'protests too much' against the alleged obscurity of the *Sonnets*." Benson certainly is not telling the truth about the sonnets,

and that he claimed for his own that it was of the same purity, *i. e.* as free from corruptions of the text, as the books published in the poet's lifetime. The phrase 'then living' seems to mean 'living at the time of publication.'" ROBERTSON (*Problems*, 1926, pp. 9 f. n.) made a similar suggestion: "Benson . . . probably meant merely to claim that Shakespeare, by letting Thorpe's Quarto pass current, had admitted the accuracy of the text—a proposition which certainly cannot stand."

themselves famous for perplexing brains and puzzling intellects; but his words, a sort of publisher's blurb, were directed just as much at the *P. P.* lyrics, the Heywood translations, the *L. C.*, the *P. & T.*, and certain lyrics from the plays, and some of them, too, have greatly perplexed, if not addled, modern brains.

Consciously or unconsciously, Benson was a humorist. The commentators are all too often literalists. So MASSEY (ed. 1888, pp. 3 f.) remarked: Sh. "gave his own personal testimony to the purity of his Sonnets. This vindication would not have been made unless some contrary charge had been brought against them. Benson having heard of this looked into the Sonnets for himself, and found they justified the claim that Shakspeare had made on their behalf." Furthermore (p. 22), when Sh. vouched for their purity, he gave the lie "to the Autobiographic rendering of the . . . [earlier] and to the personal application of the Latter Sonnets"; or, in short, he meant (to Massey's joy) that the sequence was dramatic. HENRY BROWN (*Sonnets of Sh.*, 1870, p. 27) likewise interpreted Benson's words as meaning that Sh. "upon some occasions avouched their [the sonnets'] purity, possibly from the attacks of those who only condemned that which they had not understood," and BUTLER (ed. 1899, p. 5) chimed in, saying that Sh. "during his lifetime had 'avouched the purity' [that is, the morality] of the Sonnets." MATHEW (*Image of Sh.*, 1922, p. 113) even thought it likely that Southampton, before his death in 1624, arranged for Benson to republish the sonnets in such a way as "to hide a scandalous meaning [of homosexuality] insinuated [in Q] by Thorpe." But even if Benson *had* plainly said that Sh. denied an adulterous intrigue with a black woman or a homosexual passion for a sweet boy, "The Mistress Masculine," what difference would it make? Why should Benson, almost twenty-five years after the poet's death, know anything about matters so personal? Yet as late as 1933 DOUGLAS (*True History*, p. 14) repeated Butler's explanation, asserting that, according to Benson, Sh. himself "defended the Sonnets from the imputation of impurity or immorality which has been attached to them"—but "attached" when? For all we know, not in his own lifetime.¹ KELLNER (*E. S.*, 1933, LXVIII, 61) goes as wide of the mark in another direction by calling Benson "a man of judgment," "a not unintelligent literary person," whose editorial work has "a certain authority." But, correctly enough, BRAY (ed. 1938, p. 3) called Benson's edition "one of the curiosities of literature. It has no textual value."

LEE (ed. 1905, pp. 56 f.) accepted most of the prefatory comments at their face value: "Benson's preface . . . is not very clearly phrased, but he gives no indication that the poems, which he now offers his public, were reprinted from any existing publication." Naturally. Benson was trying, pretty successfully at that, to conceal his thievery. "It may be doubted whether Benson depended on . . . [Q] in his confused impression of the sonnets. The word 'sonnets,' which loomed so large in Thorpe's edition, finds no place in Benson's. . . . [Benson] avows no knowledge of 'Shakespeares Sonnets.' Thorpe's dedication to Mr. W. H. is ignored. The order in which Thorpe printed the sonnets is disregarded. Benson presents his 'poems' in a wholly different sequence, and denies them unity of meaning. . . . The variations from

¹ On this matter see pp. 232-239, below.

Thorpe's text, though not for the most part of great importance, are numerous. . . . Benson's text seems based on some amateur collection of pieces of manuscript poetry, which had been in private circulation. His preface implies that the sonnets and poems in his collection were not among those which he knew Shakespeare to have 'avouched' (i. e. publicly acknowledged) in his lifetime." Lee sees support for his view (p. 58) in the facts that 138 and 144 are printed from the *P. P.*, not from *Q*, and that eight sonnets are omitted. In other words, he was as thoroughly taken in by Benson as was John Warren, and as doubtless were other seventeenth-century readers.

His position was rendered thoroughly untenable by ALDEN (ed. 1916, pp. 422 f.), who wrote: "A comparison of the exact texts of Benson's volume and Thorpe's quarto soon showed me that the former was unquestionably printed from the latter. For the detailed evidence, see my article in *Modern Philology*, vol. 14 (May, 1916). This may be summarized by the statement that, despite many differences, the general effect is that of a fairly close following, in the details of spelling, punctuation, and typography, of the text of 1609. In the case of italicized words—the item least likely to be dependent on MS. copy—there is not a single instance of divergence; in the matters of capitalization, punctuation, and spelling, differences are not infrequent, but are far too few to be accounted for by an independent copy. As to the printing of Sonnets 138 and 144 from the text of the *Passionate Pilgrim*, they were the first poems in that collection, and so the first to be chosen for reprinting in Benson's volume; the contents of the *Pilgrim* volume were, in general, inserted in their original order. As to the remarks in Benson's Preface, they must be regarded as deliberately intended to deceive; the book was made by reprinting the contents of three or four volumes issued some thirty years before, but purchasers were to be led to think that the material in it was new. The only piece of evidence offered by Lee in proof of the view that the volume of 1640 was not based on that of 1609, which presents any difficulty, is that concerning the eight omitted sonnets. Of this circumstance I know no wholly satisfactory explanation, though I have made some suggestions regarding it in the article cited above.¹ The upshot of all this is that the text of 1640 is without inde-

¹ [HINKLE (Stanford University *Abstracts of Dissertations*, 1937, XII, 42), arguing that Benson printed the sonnets from a manuscript, not from *Q*, attempts to explain the omissions by saying that 96 and 126 "are admittedly imperfect . . . and six others are closely connected in theme and imagery, a feature . . . which suggests that the six might well have existed originally as a separate group, to which Benson did not have access." I am aware of nobody who believes 126 to be imperfect, and it strains one's credulity to suppose that Benson omitted 96 because (unlike all other editors—Lintott, Steevens, Capell—before Malone) he recognized the identity of its final lines with those of 36. As for 18, 19, 43, 56, 75, and 76, not one of the numerous rearrangers of *Q* has ever made a group of them. It should be noted that KELLNER (*E. S.*, 1933, LXVIII, 61) had anticipated some of Hinkle's views, saying that Benson omitted 18 and 19 because they were in crass disagreement with the preceding sonnets; 96 because its final lines appeared in 36; and 126 because it is not a regular sonnet. Kellner cannot explain the omission of the others, but he is

pendent interest or authority. It corrects errors of the quarto in something like twenty passages, and makes new errors in about fifty more."

POOLER (ed. 1918, pp. ix-xv) independently reached similar conclusions, but in his second edition (1931, p. xxxix) he acknowledges Alden's "priority of publication." SQUIRE (*Life and Letters*, 1920, pp. 167 f.), SCOTT (*Sonnets élisabéthains*, 1929, p. 230), BROOKE (ed. 1936, p. 66), and BRAY (ed. 1938, p. 3) agree that Benson followed Q for his text of the sonnets, the last remarking, "Adherence to vagaries of punctuation and spelling in the Quarto, and the slavish reproduction of most of its errors . . . [as at 25.9, 11, 69.3, and 146.1] betray Benson's source." TUCKER (ed. 1924, pp. xxvi-xxviii) remains unconvinced—on purely impressionistic grounds and without fully collating the texts concerned. "It may be taken for granted," he says, "that many manuscript copies of the sonnets were in existence, and that this or that album might not only contain different arrangements according to the manner of gathering the several pieces, but also suffer from incompleteness." To take this for granted for the sonnets alone is an extremely large order; to take it for granted also for the entire texts of the *P. & T.*, 1601, the *L. C.*, 1609, and the *P. P.*, 1612, which Benson reprinted without much change of readings and in the case of the *P. P.* with little change in arrangement, is impossible.

None the less, G. H. HINKLE, in his Stanford University thesis, "*Shakespeare's Poems of 1640*, 1936, tries to sustain the Lee-Tucker decision instead of the correct view presented by Pooler and Alden. "We may safely say," he declares (*Stanford Abstracts*, 1937, XII, 45), "that Benson's versions of the poems which appeared in Jaggard's collection of 1612 [the *P. P.*], of *The Phoenix and the Turtle* [1601] and of *A Lover's Complaint* [Q], must have rested upon some form of manuscript copy. . . . The poetry listed above came into his [Benson's] hands mingled with manuscript copies of Shakespeare's sonnets." Only a miracle could have produced such results; but Hinkle contends in his preface that "Benson must have used throughout some collection of manuscript as a master copy"; that this (hypothetical) manuscript was in some way "associated with" Jaggard; and that "a gifted and cultivated amateur of verse" made in the manuscript numerous changes of readings that were taken over for the 1640 *Poems*. Such a theory is, *a priori*, incredible; and a word by word comparison of the 1640 text with the 1601, 1609, and 1612 texts shows it to be impossible. Hinkle declares (p. 195) that Benson's text of the poems occurring in the 1612 *P. P.* "offers the most convincing case for an amateur's [manuscript] redaction as a source." Actually, I think, not one really significant variant occurs—not one that cannot be explained as a modernization or a misprint or an ordinary emendation. There is not a single change in the 1640 *Poems* that could not have been made from the printed 1612 text by any competent typesetter without assistance from any other source, manuscript or printed. In page after page, line after line, the two are almost exactly alike, even in their misprints. To be sure, Hinkle argues that the 1640 text constantly deferred to *Troia Britanica*, 1609, for readings in the nine Heywood poems borrowed therefrom by the 1612 *P. P.* Indeed, he hinges (p. 145)

sure that so thoughtful and independent an editor as Benson had good reasons for leaving them out.]

most of his case on this one supposed fact: "The striking divergence in [Heywood's] *Paris to Hellen*, l. 515, in which Benson has *strike*, *The Passionate Pilgrim strick*, and *Troia Britanica strict* (the last is correct), will demonstrate both Benson's and Jaggard's independence of a printed text." Earlier (p. 138) he had called this reading one of the two variants (it is certainly the more significant looking) "which alone throw the third edition of *P. P.* out of consideration as a source." The copy of Benson consulted by Hinkle may perhaps have had *strike*, but the five copies examined by me have *stricke*. Accordingly the "variant" loses all value: it is only one of innumerable cases in which Benson's compositor added a final *e* to a *P. P.* word, and hence it tends not to refute but to confirm the other evidence that the text of the 1640 *Poems* was based directly on that of the 1612 *P. P.* Hinkle (pp. 132 f.) also cites "two other variants . . . of extreme importance" that "seem definitely to rule out" the *P. P.* as the source of Benson's text: he says that in "*Paris to Hellen*," lines 497, 501 f., *Troia Britanica* and Benson read "Blush you at this! or Lady doe you feare," "Ist possible, that you a world to winne, / Should keep that face? that beauty without sinne?" while the *P. P.* omits the "!" in the first quotation, the first "?" in the second. Once again these details, admittedly the most significant Hinkle could find, do not apply to the copies I (and presumably Benson's printer) examined. As for the exclamation point, it appears in both the *P. P.* and Benson, while *Troia Britanica* has a comma; and as for the question mark, it occurs only in the *P. P.*, while the two other texts have a comma. The first of these details, then (though it seems to me of small importance anyhow), makes flatly against Hinkle's thesis; the second does not support it, for a typesetter who, like Benson's, continually reduced colons to commas might reasonably be expected to change an excrescent, mid-sentence question mark to a comma. Hinkle complains that Alden's results are vitiated by the fact (if it be a fact) that he compared only the 1609 text of the sonnets with Benson, ignoring the *L. C.* and the rest of the so-called Miscellany Poems. A letter by letter collation of *all* the poems attributed to Sh. in the 1601, 1609, 1612, and 1640 texts leaves no doubt in my mind that Alden's conclusions are entirely correct. Space and time are lacking to give full details of the collations here (many—excluding variants of spelling—appear in the Textual Notes in volume I and in Sh.'s *Poems*, 1938). But everybody who now thinks carefully about the matter will, I imagine, concede that if the 1640 text had been set into type from a manuscript instead of from Q, the *P. P.*, and other books that "master manuscript" would have been unique in literary history for the closeness with which it followed the earlier printed texts in spelling, misprints, typography—and the 1640 compositor would have been unparalleled in the records of early English printing for the accuracy with which he, in turn, reproduced the manuscript. Hinkle's theory is unnecessary to explain the occasional unimportant variations between Q and the *P. P.* on the one hand and Benson's 1640 text on the other, all of them due to modernization, emendation, or careless composition; and it is unable to account for their innumerable and striking identities.

LATER HISTORY OF THE 1640 TEXT

Completely devoid of textual authority as it is, Benson's volume had great influence.¹ Since in it the dedication to Mr. W. H. was omitted and the man friend was in many cases disguised as a woman, it and its numerous editors postponed till 1780, as POOLER (ed. 1918, p. xv) observes, "the birth of theories as to the story of the Sonnets," which arose only when Q was resurrected and studied by modern scholars. The first eighteenth-century edition of the sonnets, that attributed to CHARLES GILDON (1665-1724), accepted the 1640 *Poems* as canonical, reprinting without question the greater part of its contents. Gildon showed a little editorial discrimination by omitting everything in Benson's volume from the middle of sig. K8 to the end (M4): that is, he ended with "Why should this [a] desert be" (from *As You Like It*), eliminating the three elegies on Sh. (K8-L1^v) as well as all the "Addition of some Excellent Poems . . . By other Gentlemen" (L2-M4). Published by Edmund Curll and E. Sanger, his book was an unauthorized supplement, called volume VII, to Rowe's edition (Jacob Tonson, 1709) of Sh.'s plays. It came out in September, 1709.² The individual title-pages of *Venus* and *Lucrece* bear the date 1709, the "Poems on Several Occasions" (that is, the partial reprint of Benson's 1640 volume) have no separate title, and the general title-page for the whole volume is pre-dated 1710. ALDEN (*M. L. N.*, 1916, XXXI, 268 f.) points out that in all but one copy seen by him the dedication is signed "S. N.," an ascription which the British Museum catalog and JAGGARD's *Sh. Bibliography*, 1911 (p. 434), accept;³ but that in the New York Public Library copy the signature is given as "Charles Gildon." Gildon is mentioned as the editor of the 1709/10 volume in Sewall's 1725 edition (Preface, pp. viii-xi), and again in his 1728 edition (pp. vi-ix). What share, if any, he had in the actual preparation of the text, it seems impossible to tell. The 1710 Gildon is, of its kind, not a bad editorial job. It more or less modernized the 1640 text in spelling and punctuation, and made a considerable number of emenda-

¹ LEE (ed. 1905, p. 58 n.) remarks: "In 1654 there was issued a catalogue of books '*printed for Humphrey Moseley and are to be sold at his Shop at the Prince's Armes in St. Paule's Churchyard.*' Among the books noticed is '*Poems written by Mr. William Shakespeare Gent.*' The entry suggests that Moseley caused to be printed and published a new issue of Shakespeare's poems, but there is no trace of any such edition." FARR (*Library*, March, 1923, p. 252), giving the same information, observes that "no transfer of this [Benson's] volume is recorded [in the Stationers' Register], but it appears to have been taken over by Humphrey Moseley about 1655"—the date he assigns to the Moseley catalog mentioned by Lee. He refers also to a second, "slightly later" catalog. E. A. B. BARNARD (*New Links*, 1930, pp. 98 f.) gives a facsimile of an inventory of books made by Walter Savage, of Broadway, around 1667, which includes "Shakespears Poems 00: 00: 08."

² For further details about Gildon's and Lintott's editions see Sh.'s *Poems*, 1938, pp. 380-383. For the dates by which they are referred to in these volumes see I, xi n.

³ FORD (*Shakespeare*, 1935, p. 14) interprets the signature as "the terminal letters of Charles Gildon."

tions or errors, as in 22.3, 27.5, 38.7, 39.12, 44.4, 47.9, 50.2, 105.1, 106.7, 109.4, 129.9, some of which are useful in determining the source of later editors' texts.

In 1714 a revised edition of GILDON appeared, this time as a supplement, volume IX, to Rowe's 1714 edition of Sh.'s plays. ALDEN (*M. L. N.*, 1916, XXXI, 270 f., 274) describes it: "The text is newly revised, and in more than a perfunctory way. . . . In reality, this 1714 volume not only gives us a new and interesting revision of the text, but was evidently used freely by Sewell and Ewing in the subsequent editions prepared by them." "If Gildon was indeed the maker of the text of 1710, there would seem to be no reason to doubt that this is his own revision of his earlier work (he lived till 1724), and we may then properly denote the two Curll texts as 'Gildon 1st' and 'Gildon 2nd.' . . . In the later editions of the eighteenth century they [the readings of 'Gildon 2nd'] recur abundantly; and so largely have the readings formerly attributed to Sewell been shown to be due to the editor of 1714, that Sewell's importance . . . dwindles decidedly. . . . If these two editions were the work of Gildon, he is the one important predecessor of Malone in the making of the text of Shakespeare's Sonnets." Many new readings—some conscious emendations, others probably typographical errors—occur in the 1714 text; as at 1.3, 23.4, 12, 41.3, 62.4, 83.2, 87.6, 98.1, 111.4, 113.8, 117.7, 119.1, 7, 120.3, 12, 145.11.

In 1725 the hack-writer GEORGE SEWELL, M. D., made certain changes in the Gildon-Curll text and then published the result as volume VI of Pope's 1723-1725 edition of Sh.'s dramas. It was reissued as volume VIII in the Dublin edition—"possibly unauthorized," says FORD (*Shakespeare*, 1935, p. 21)—of Pope in 1726. Sewell died on February 8 of that year. Before that date (unless someone else used his name) he revised his text, again with reference to Gildon, and after his death it was published as volume X of Pope's 1728 Sh. In both editions Gildon's essays on the stage, the plays, and the poems are reprinted with proper credit. The 1725 edition sometimes follows Gildon's 1710 text (as in 21.5, 41.6, 72.6, 82.7, 122.2, 127.10, 128.11, 129.9, 131.1, 141.14, 149.5), at other times Gildon's 1714 text (as at 12.4, 23.4, 34.12, 84.14, 85.5, 95.12, 104.11, 114.6); and it introduces various new readings (as at 9.12, 23.9, 26.8, 71.2, 74.8, 83.2, 105.14, 112.4, 142.2). The 1728 edition was revised after further close study of Gildon, adopting readings that in 1725 Sewell had failed to take from the 1714 text (as at 7.12, 14.8, 29.12, 35.9, 41.3, 55.7, 69.3, 11, 89.9, 104.4, 110.2, 117.7, 125.1, 130.7), or else changing readings to agree with both of Gildon's texts (as at 5.8, 26.5, 13, 31.11, 58.3, 97.4, 106.8, 121.3). On the other hand, it does not accept a number of changes made by Gildon in 1714 (as at 65.6, 98.1, 113.8, 119.1, 7, 145.11), while it introduces a few new readings (as at 20.7, 34.10, 12, 62.7).

LEWIS THEOBALD planned to be the next editor of the *Poems*, and it seems certain that he intended to emulate Gildon and Sewell in following the 1640 text, improving it by emendations of the sort for which he is still famous. But by 1735 he had given up the plan (see p. 334, below), and apparently six years passed before the next edition appeared. This was the undated (1741?) *Poems on Several Occasions. By Shakespeare* with the imprint of the London publishers A. MURDEN, R. NEWTON, T. DAVIDSON, C. ANDERSON, W. NELSON, and S. PATERSON.¹ It was based upon Sewell's second edition (1728), but

¹ It is dated "c. 1760" by JAGGARD (*Sh. Bibliography*, 1911, p. 435), the

introduces certain changes—as at 11.14, 23.5, 41.9, 48.8, 85.12, 115.7, 153.14—that reappear in the 1774 and 1775 texts, as well as many others—as at 9.13, 36.3, 38.2, 39.1, 51.8, 103.5, 8, 106.10, 12, 114.4, 116.10, 12, 118.14, 129.11, 140.4, 5—that turn up in no later text studied by me.

The *Poems* published by THOMAS EWING at Dublin as part of his 1771 edition (volume XIII) of Johnson's Sh., has a remarkable number of emendations and errors (as at 9.3, 37.14, 41.8, 49.1, 52.4, 57.3, 79.2, 85.14, 87.2, 93.14, 95.9, 100.12, 107.3, 114.2, 133.8, 141.5, 147.2) rejected by all subsequent editors.

FRANCIS GENTLEMAN in 1774 edited the works of Sh., nine volumes, for John Bell, of London, who shared the publishing venture with C. Etherington, of York. The *Poems written by Shakespear* has a special engraved title-page, dated September, 1774, with no reference (in the copies I have seen) to "Plays," "Works," or "Volume," but on the first page of each signature (B-N) "Vol. IX." appears. Entries for Gentleman in the Textual Notes are based upon one of the copies (G.4065.49) in the Boston Public Library, which agrees with the second Boston Library copy (G.88.11) and with the Harvard copy in following seven readings (given above) introduced by the 1741 text. All the copies that I have examined have a large number of misprints in common, as at 13.9, 22.9, 23.14, 37.7, 68.1, 73.12, 79.14, 93.3, 105.9, 121.7, 127.14, 131.11, 147.8, 154.2. But they vary from one another in a great many readings, as the following examples show:

B.P.L. G.4065.49 ¹	Harvard	B.P.L. G.88.11
1.4 air	heir	air
1.12 And . . . churl	And . . . churl	And, . . . churl,
2.7 deep-sunken	deep sunken	deep-sunken
2.8 Were	Were	Where
8.6 thy	thy	thine
9.6 hast	has	hast
12.11 do	to	do
15.6 Chear'd	Chear'd	Cheared
21.13 Set	Let	Let
23.2 besides	besides	beside
24.3 frame	frame	same

British Museum catalog, and other authorities. G. E. DAWSON, however, tells me that the only evidence for dating is supplied by James Hulett's frontispiece, a reproduction of the Sh. monument in Westminster Abbey which was unveiled on January 29, 1741, and which remained without any inscription till May 16. He thinks that Hulett's engraving, representing the monument as bearing an inscription by "A. Pope," was made "not long before January 29 nor later than May, 1741," and that the *Poems* belongs to the first half of the year 1741. Dawson also sees a possible piratical connection between this volume and Theobald's 1740 edition of the plays; and he notes that the very names of the publishers are suspect, since only one—that of Paterson, who was thirteen years of age in 1741—occurs in PLOMER, BUSHNELL, and DIX's *Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers . . . 1726 to 1775*, 1932.

¹ A copy in the Library of Congress agrees with this copy in the readings listed.

B.P.L. G.4065.49	Harvard	B.P.L. G.88.11
24.13 want	wanting	want
28.12 th'	th'	the
29.10 state,	state	state,
32.11 brought	brought	bought
36.10 bewailed	bewailing	bewailed
42.9 lose . . . loss	lose . . . lose	loase . . . loss
46.3 Mine . . . would	Mine . . . would	My . . . should
46.4 mine	mine	my
48.7 mine	mine	my
49.12 thy	thy	my
51.3 Form	Form	From
57.5 world-without- end-hour	world-without- end-hour	world-without- end hour
58.3 ours	hours	hours
60.1 pibbled	pibbled	pebbled
64.10 confounded,	confounded	confounded,
65.9 meditation	mediation	meditation
66.7 perfection	perfection	protection
67.10 veins?	veins?	veins;
68.6 sepulchers	sepulchers	sepulchre
70.6 the	the	be
82.1 marry'd	martyr'd	marry'd
85.4 phrase	praise	phrase
86.13 countenance	count'nance	countenance
88.13 love,	love	love,
103.10 well?	well.	well.
107.13 shalt	shall	shall
113.6 flower	flowers	flowers
120.10 true	the true	the true
131.11 bear:	bear,	bear,
133.12 not then	not	not
142.14 may'st thou	thou may'st	thou may'st
152.1 am	am not	am
153.3 his	by his	his
153.9 love's	love	love's
153.12 thither	neither	thither
154.9 quenched	quenched	quench'd
154.12 mistress'	mistres's	mistress'

The undated *Poems written by Mr William Shakespeare*, 1775, of the book-seller THOMAS EVANS (1742-1784) was (says JAGGARD, *Sh. Bibliography*, 1911, p. 435) "perhaps edited by E. Capell" as a supplement to the latter's *Sh.* of 1767-1768. It has the misprints or corrections at 11.14, 23.5, 41.9, 48.8, 85.12, 115.7, 153.14 introduced by the 1741 editor,¹ but does not follow his

¹ At 154.5 Evans has *faire*, but the word is followed by a space obviously intended for the dropped letters *st*.

odd readings at 9.13, 36.3, 39.1, 51.8, 103.5, and so on (see p. 31, above). Nor does it follow Gentleman's new readings.¹

The dramatist W. C. OULTON (1770?-1820?) issued in 1804 a queer two-volume edition. His notes and emendations, drawn chiefly from Malone's 1780 and 1790 editions, show that he had a thorough acquaintance with those volumes, but his text follows the 1640 order except in one slight detail—that is, 67-69, instead of being the first "poem" in his book, come between "poems" 38-40 and 41, 42. "As these Sonnets are in 154 stanzas," he says (II, 179), "peculiar passages have been selected, under appropriate heads, which will be more acceptable to readers in general"—a strange assertion, because the "appropriate heads" are the titles that go back to the 1640 volume, which has, not one hundred fifty-four sonnets like Q, but one hundred forty-six. Since he knew that the 1640 edition contained many poems not by Sh.,² it is strange that he was willing to print the latter under Sh.'s name. In his preliminary matter Oulton adapts Gentleman's comments but with various additions and omissions. His text reproduces most of the readings introduced by Gentleman (although some of these are emended in his notes); he has also many new readings or misprints which occur in no later edition that I have seen, as *thy* for *thine* (2.7), *or* for *of* (4.8), *fire* for *sire* (8.11), *the* for *their* (15.8), *wit* for *whit* (33.13), *soul* for *sole* (36.7), *Know* for *No* (40.3), *know* for *now* (45.11), and *it* for *audit* (49.4), *heart* for *art* (68.14), *I'm asham'd* for *I am sham'd* (72.13), *impart* for *import* (122.14), *un-feather'd* for *unfather'd* (124.2), *running* for *ruining* (125.4), *is* for *as* (130.13), *ill-wrestling* for *ill-wresting* (140.11), *friend* for *fiend* (144.9), *why* for *which* (147.8).³ In 1829 Oulton's work was justly

¹ But at 51.3 Evans, like Gentleman, misprints *Form* for *From*.

² He mentions Heywood's authorship of the Ovidian translations at II, 230, 244.

³ Another group of new readings in Oulton reappear in the two BOSTON editions of 1807 and 1808 (which were not printed from Oulton, since they do not follow the unique readings listed above)—*all up* for *up all* (73.8), *will show* for *will truly show* (77.5), *look* for *looks* (93.7), *working* for *workings* (93.11), *has* for *had* (99.11), *golden* for *gilded* (101.11), *kind* for *kinds* (109.10), *most* for *most most* (110.14), *other* for *others* (112.10), *To* for *The* (113.12), *Crowding* for *Crowning* (115.12), *hateful* for *healthful* (118.11), *the fond* for *find the* (118.13), *drank . . . Syren's* for *drunk . . . Syren* (119.1), *rant* for *rank* (122.3), *attention* for *retention* (122.9), *t'* for *th'* (124.8), *fairer* for *fairest* (131.12), *a* for *the* (136.9), *me not* for *not me* (139.1). All three agree in reading *to thee, thyself* (79.14) and *On one* (131.11), evidently emendations of Gentleman's misprints, and in reading (unlike Gentleman) *wit* (84.11), *idle* (105.2), *ill* (119.14), and *every* (127.14). Moreover, where there are variations in the copies of Gentleman which I have seen, all three follow (with three or four exceptions) the readings of the Boston Public Library G.88.11 except at 42.9, 103.10, 107.13, 120.10, 131.11, 133.12, 142.14. All but two of the differences from Gentleman which these three editions have in common occur in sonnets printed in sig. K in Gentleman. In view of the great variation in the four copies of Gentleman examined by me, it seems possible that the 1804 edition and the Boston 1807 and 1808 editions derive from still another issue of Gentleman with an uncorrected sig. K.

described by JAMES BROUGHTON (*G. M.*, XCIX, i, 225) as "corrupt in the text to a degree . . . scarcely [to] be credited."

The FIRST BOSTON edition of Sh.'s plays was issued in sixteen parts during 1802-1804 by Edmund Munroe and David Francis. JANE SHERZER (*P. M. L. A.*, 1907, XXII, 643) thought that the editing was done by Munroe himself, whereas WESTFALL (*American Shakespearean Criticism*, 1939, pp. 102 f.) is inclined to believe that "both the publishers participated in the editing."¹ Three years later the same firm began to issue a second subscription edition of Sh.'s plays, the first part being on sale at forty-two cents in February, 1807 (*Boston Monthly Anthology*, p. 109).

After various other parts had been issued, a rival firm, Edward Oliver and Isaac Munroe, issued proposals, dated August 5, for an independent volume of Sh.'s poems (*Boston Columbian Centinel*, August 8, 1807, p. 3): "It is presumed [they advertised], that all who have in possession the *Plays* of SHAKESPEARE [that is, those in the two editions published by Munroe and Francis], will be desirous of having *complete*, the works of this great master piece of nature; and therefore, patronize and encourage the publication of his POEMS." This book (here called BOSTON¹), announced as "THIS DAY published" in the *Boston Gazette*, November 2, 1807 (p. 3), was the first *separate* American (and, what in local rivalry was more important, the first *Boston*) edition of the non-dramatic verse. It has the title, *The Poems of Shakespeare. To Which Is Added an Account of His Life. First American Edition*, and the imprint of Oliver and Munroe, Belcher and Armstrong. Boston¹ (with 258 pages) reprints Gentleman's 1774 preliminary remarks almost exactly, and reproduces his text, appending, however, the spurious poem (by Charles Dibdin) of "Ann Hathaway" (beginning, "Would ye be taught, ye feather'd throng"). Since the compositor followed Gentleman's text, he automatically inserted "VOL. IX." at the bottom of the first page of every signature beginning with D except F and G.

Meanwhile, Edmund Munroe and Francis had hastened to advertise in the *Repertory*, August 7, 1807 (p. 3), and in the *Monthly Anthology*, November, 1807 (p. 460), a new volume of their own. According to the latter journal, they have decided to "add another volume to their edition of Shakespeare's Dramatick Works, which will be the ninth volume, and contain all SHAKESPEARE'S POEMS and the Critical Essays of Professor Richardson.—It will be printed to conform with their first edition [1802-1804], so that gentlemen desirous of adding it to that edition may be accommodated." More than a year went by before the volume (BOSTON²) thus planned made its appearance. According to an advertisement in the *Columbian Centinel*, August 27, 1808 (p. 3), volumes VIII (of the plays) and IX (the poems) "will on Monday [August 29] be ready for delivery." The *Boston Gazette*, August 29 (p. 3), lists Boston² as published on that day.

The copies of BOSTON² I have seen contain the general, engraved title-page of the whole series: *The Dramatick Works of William Shakespeare. Printed Complete. . . . Vol. IX.*, with the imprint, "Boston: Printed by Munroe & Francis. 1807. Second Edition." But this general title-page is preceded by the half-title, "Shakespeare's Dramatick Works. Volume Ninth. Containing

¹ Westfall's account of the Boston *Poems* is extremely confused.

the Poems of Shakespeare, and Richardson's Essays, on His Principal Dramatick Characters." The poems run to 204 (numbered) pages. The "Essays" (pages [1]-187) have a separate title-page dated 1808. A "List of Subscribers to the Second Boston Edition" fills pages [189]-[200]. The text of Boston² is entirely different from that of Boston¹. The contents of both are identical with two exceptions: in Boston² "Ann Hathaway" is omitted and the final poem, "Rosalinda," is canceled.¹

BOSTON² likewise appeared in at least two other issues. One of these (New York Public Library), called to my attention by my student M. W. S. SWAN,² contains only the poems (not Richardson's essays) and (instead of the 1807 engraved general title used for the eight other volumes) has a cancel title, *The Poems of William Shakspeare. Comprehending Venus and Adonis, Tarquin and Lucrece, and Poems on Several Occasions*, with the imprint of Munroe, Francis, and Parker, 1808. The other (Boston Public Library) has this same title, and the imprint of Munroe, Francis, and Parker, 1809. It, too, omits the essays by Richardson. Both books, in spite of their new title-pages, are mere reissues of old sheets belonging to the original Boston².

The separate 1807 edition (BOSTON¹) and the volume IX variously dated 1807, 1808, and 1809 (BOSTON²) have a striking similarity in spelling and punctuation. In the use of italics, however, the former resembles Gentleman and Oulton, the latter substitutes roman type. Both have a considerable number of common misprints as well as some apparent emendations of the 1774 text. For example, each has the following readings, none of which occur in Gentleman and Oulton: *shall* for *shalt* (9.3, 142.4), *pictures'* (46.3), *eyes'* (46.13, 47.14), *Art* (48.8), *flow* for *slow* (51.6), *me than mine own* (72.6), *other* for *others* (78.11), *bodies'* (91.2), *winters'* (104.3), *prepost'rously* (109.11), *birds, of* (113.6), *bosom* (120.12), *others'* (121.4 f.), *bare* for *bear* (131.11), *in her* for *her in* (143.5). On the other hand, Boston¹ has a few misprints not found in Boston²; as, *between* for *beweepe* (29.2), *mountains* for *fountains* (35.2), *way* for *away* (91.14), *the* for *thy* (92.10), *your* for *you* (106.10), *from* for *form* (113.5), *amongst* for *among* (124.4). Boston² differs from the Oulton and Boston¹ texts in reading *be* for *he* (63.14), *Thus* (68.1), *sepulchres* (68.6), *that due* (69.3), *Thine* (69.5), *in* for *but* (87.14), *You* for *Yet* (98.13), *not red* for *nor red* (99.10), *other* for *others* (142.8). It has also a number of readings that appear in Oulton but not in Boston¹, as *fame* for *same* (5.3), *rememberance* (5.12), *'force* for *'fore* (7.11), *live* for *lives* (11.5), *commit* for *commits* (41.1), *monuments* for *monument* (55.1), *were* (104.14), *pity* for *pity'd* (142.12). The evidence appears to indicate that Boston¹ was set from some copy of Gentleman unknown to me (see p. 33 n., above) or from Gentleman with occasional borrowings from Oulton; and that Boston² was set from Boston¹ with a change here and there to Oulton's readings.

¹ After the printer had set up the title and two lines, "Why should this a desert be, / For is it [*sic*] unpeopled? No." he was stopped, and in all copies the three lines of type are covered by pasted slips.

² To whose admirable paper in my Sh. seminary (it has since been published in the American Bibliographical Society *Papers*, 1942, XXXVI, 27-36) I owe the foregoing references to Boston newspapers as well as the differentiation between the two Munroes.

The THIRD BOSTON edition of Sh.'s works was issued by Edmund Munroe and David Francis¹ in 1810-1812. *Pericles* and the poems appear in volume IX, which was published on September 26, 1812,² and which has the general title-page, *The Works of William Shakspeare. In Nine Volumes. With the Corrections and Illustrations of Dr. Johnson, G. Steevens, and Others, Revised by Isaac Reed. Third Boston, from the Fifth London Edition. Vol. IX, and a separate title-page,³ Volume IX. of Shakspeare's Plays. Containing Pericles. Illustrations and Notes. Tàrquin and Lucrece. Venus and Adonis. Poems on Several Occasions. Copied from the Text of Dr. Reed. With Notes, by Johnson, Steevens, and Others.* The poems—which end with the *P. & T.* (that is, “Why should this a desert be” and “Ann Hathaway” are omitted)—are reprinted from Boston², and are accompanied by a few readings from Oulton as well as scattering footnotes, also mainly from him, some of them calling attention to misprints in the text.

Apparently the last edition to follow the text originated so shamelessly by Benson in 1640 was that of HENRY DURRELL, New York, 1817, 1818. Durrell's edition—ten volumes of plays—was reissued with the imprint of COLLINS and HANNAY in 1821, 1823, and later years (WESTFALL, *American Shakespearean Criticism*, pp. 116 f.). H. N. PAUL, in his manuscript *Editions of the Collected Works of Sh. Published in the United States. 1795-1865* (Folger Sh. Library), says (p. 44) with reference to Durrell's edition and the Collins-Hannay issues, “It is evident that both text and foot notes were set up from the Third Boston Edition, of which it is in part a paginal reprint, with some changes of spelling and punctuation. . . . The Poems of the Boston Edition have been omitted, but sets with the Collins & Hannay imprint may be found with the poems (pages 1-204) from Vol. IX of the Third Boston bound up as Vol. XI of the set.” I have been unable to find a copy of volume XI.

LATER HISTORY OF THE 1609 TEXT

Meanwhile, BERNARD LINTOTT (1675-1736) had published in July, 1709, *A Collection of Poems*, containing in one volume *Venus, Lucrece*, and the *P. P.* of 1599. Some nineteen months later, in February, 1711, he got out an enlarged edition called *A Collection of Poems, In Two Volumes; Being all the Miscellanies of Mr. William Shakespeare, which were Publish'd by himself in the Year 1609. and now correctly Printed from those Editions. The First Volume contains, I. Venus and Adonis. II. The Rape of Lucrece. III. The Passionate Pilgrim. IV. Some Sonnets set to sundry Notes of Musick. The Second Volume contains One Hundred and Fifty Four Sonnets, all of them in Praise of his Mis-*

¹ In addition to their names the imprint of volumes III-IX also has those of Ezra Sargeant, New York, and Edward Earle, Philadelphia, 1812; that of volumes I and II has the imprint of Sargeant, Hopkins, and Earle added.

² According to the *Columbian Centinel* of that date, p. 3.

³ In the Boston Public Library copy this title-page, together with the preliminary material for *Pericles*, is misplaced after the text of *Pericles* and “Addenda” to the earlier volumes and before the poems.

tress. II. *A Lover's Complaint of his Angry Mistress*.¹ This second issue consists of volume I, exactly as it was originally published in 1709 but with the new general title-page as given above and with a separately titled second volume. Of the latter H. N. PAUL and G. E. DAWSON² remark: "From two advertisements in the *Post-Boy* it appears that the second volume, containing the *Sonnets*, was issued separately (sold for 1s.) on 27 Feb. 1710/11 and that three days later the two volumes (bound as one) appeared furnished with the new general title. The great rarity of copies of the first volume alone, as published in 1709, and the apparent non-existence of copies of the second volume alone, without the general two-volume title, indicate that when vol. ii was issued separately the general title was supplied so that the owners of the 1709 vol. i could bind up the complete Poems." They describe, also, a third issue (in two slightly different "states") of the two volumes, dated 1711 or 1712, which changes the individual title-pages of *Venus*, *Lucrece*, the *P. P.*, and the "Sonnets To Sundry Notes of Musicke" so that all bear the inaccurate legend, "Printed in the Year 1609"; and quote the following advertisement, apparently composed by Lintott himself, from the *Post-Boy*, March 3, 1710/11: "Some of these Miscellanies were printed from an Old Edition, which Mr. Congreve oblig'd me with; others from an ingenious Gentleman of the Middle-Temple, who is pleas'd to leave his old Copy with me, to shew any Person that has a mind to gratify this [*sic*] Curiosity therewith."³

LINTOTT was the publisher of these volumes. Who edited them is not known. At any rate, the unknown editor did a good job, reproducing the text of Q, which had been lost to sight after 1640, with commendable fidelity, and almost never indulging in emendations, even where they were badly needed. But Lintott's 1711 title-page seems to refer to the Benson text—probably to the use of it by Gildon, who in the preface to the 1709 edition had attacked him for following the 1599 *P. P.*, instead of the texts given in the 1640 *Poems*. It is, in all likelihood, with Gildon in mind that in 1711 Lintott claimed to have

¹ An anonymous writer in 1828 (*G. M.*, XCVIII, i, 36) notes that Lintott's first volume appeared on August 3, 1709, referring to an advertisement in the *Tatler* of August 6-9 (actually the notice there is repeated from the preceding issue, of August 4-6), and that "about Feb. 1710-11, appeared the second volume," referring to the *Post-Boy* of March 3 and July 31, 1711. He also quotes Lintott's references to Congreve, and asserts that it is "not improbable Congreve was in part editor of the work." DOWDEN (ed. 1881, p. 44) calls attention to an advertisement of the just-published second volume in the *Post-Boy*, February 24-27, 1710/11. ALFRED ROBBINS (*N. & Q.*, August 19, 1922, pp. 145 f.) repeats some of these details.

² Whose manuscript notes on Lintott and Gildon, part of a forthcoming bibliography of *Sh.'s Works, 1709-1865*, I had the privilege of seeing in 1936.

³ MALONE (*Inquiry*, 1796, p. 28) writes: "In the year 1710, Bernard Lintott . . . published our author's Poems, from copies (as I have lately discovered) furnished by Mr. Congreve, which, though not the original editions, were then considered as great curiosities; so little at that time were the shops of book-sellers, or the libraries of the learned, furnished with the early impressions of the works of the English Poets."

reprinted "all the Miscellanies of Mr. William Shakespeare, which were Publish'd by himself in the Year 1609." The claim is not very accurately phrased: it implies that Sh. published all his poems—*Venus*, *Lucrece*, the *P. P.*, as well as the sonnets—in 1609; but it also implies that Lintott's is the only correct modern reprint, and, as actually was true, that Benson's and Gildon's are not reliable. But the influence of the 1640 text, where various words are changed to make the sonnets applicable to a woman instead of a man, is likewise observable in Lintott's description of the sonnets in his volume II, "all of them in Praise of his Mistress." Here, too, he reflects Gildon's idea (p. 447) that "these Poems being most to his [Sh.'s] Mistress it is not at all unlikely, that she kept them by her till they fell into her Executors Hands or some Friend," who published them.

The first modern and scholarly reprint of Q appeared in GEORGE STEEVENS'S *Twenty of the Plays of Sh.*, 1766, but the complete absence of editorial or critical comments prevented it from having any influence on the text of the sonnets or on later editors like Ewing, Gentleman, and Evans. EDWARD CAPELL, however, almost simultaneously, was planning to edit Q, and his "copy" (the "Capell MS."), a corrected text of Lintott, 1711, was ready for the printer, but apparently never set up in type. Judging from his preface, dated 1766, Capell finished his work before Steevens's text appeared, or, at least, in ignorance of it; for he attacks Benson and the eighteenth-century editors for foisting upon Sh. poor texts and spurious verses: "But what signify publishings, or reclaimings of real authors, when the press labours with a volume, and materials to fill it out properly are not at hand? a true genius in this sort of traffick sets them at nought and that the Poet is made to know to his cost. For in 1640, his '*Sonnets*' were set out by one *Benson*; not as in their only true copy, and as they lye in this volume, but in groups of his own invention, and with titles prefix'd to them; and the rubbish of both those pamphlets of which account has been just given, is either thrown at the end, or intermix'd along with them. And this is the identical volume, that—with addition of the two larger pieces, the '*Lucrece*' and the '*Venus and Adonis*,' both carelessly printed from we know not what copies,—has been follow'd, from that time to this, in impressions of all sizes, and now passes upon the world for the genuine poems of *Shakespeare*."

Whether EDMOND MALONE (1741–1812) had seen the "Capell MS." or not is doubtful, though the CAMBRIDGE EDITORS (1866, 1893) seem to imply that he had. It appears certain that the gentleman called "C" in Malone's annotations was CAPELL,¹ so that the two scholars must have talked to each other about the faulty texts of Gildon and later editors. In his *Supplement to the Edition of Sh.'s Plays Published in 1778 by Samuel Johnson and George Steevens* of 1780 he fails to mention either Capell's unpublished work or Steevens's 1766 reprint. "Though near a century and a half has elapsed since the death of Shakspeare," he writes (p. iv), "it is somewhat extraordinary, that none of his various editors should have attempted to separate his genuine poetical compositions from the spurious performances with which they have been so long intermixed, or taken the trouble to compare them with the earliest editions. Shortly after his death, a very incorrect impression of his poems

¹ BOSWELL (ed. 1821) identifies "C" thus.

was issued out, which in every subsequent edition has been implicitly followed."¹ Again, in his 1790 edition (p. 193) MALONE remarks that the 1640 *Poems*, "though of no authority or value, was followed by Dr. Sewell, and other modern editors. The order of the original copy was not adhered to, and according to the fashion of that time, fantastick titles were prefixed to different portions of these poems. . . . Heywood's translations from Ovid, which had been originally blended with Shakspeare's poems in 1612, were likewise reprinted in the same volume." In the *Supplement* of 1780 and then in *The Plays and Poems of William Sh.*, 1790 (volume X), MALONE gave the first really important critical text of the sonnets, as of the other poems, and (with the aid of STEEVENS and others) the first commentary. His effect on the text was immense: for the majority of editors before 1864 he left little to do except to insert (or omit) an occasional hyphen, to change a period or comma here or there, to modernize some archaic spelling. No nineteenth-century or twentieth-century editor has done textual work at all comparable in importance to Malone's; few have surpassed him as an annotator; and dozens have taken credit for details borrowed from him without acknowledgment. Truly, one knows not whether to marvel more that he in that misty time could see so clearly, or that we in this supposedly clear age walk so stumblingly after him. He will be praised of ages yet to come.

Though the 1640 text made a few reappearances after 1780, Malone's edition may be said to have given it a *coup de grace* among scholars. In the FIRST AMERICAN edition, that in volume VIII of Bioren and Madan's *The Plays and Poems of William Sh.*, Philadelphia, 1795-1796,² Malone's 1790 text is said to be followed, "after carefully collating it with the different Collections extant." The Advertisement tells that "To render this Edition a complete Collection . . . it has been recommended to print uniformly with his Dramatic Pieces, the genuine POEMS of this celebrated Bard," and that two poems excluded by Malone ("Why should this a desert be" from *As You Like It* and "Come live with me and be my dear" from *England's Helicon*, 1600, 1614, both of which

¹ This sentence indicates that Malone had not seen Lintott or Capell's revision of it. Probably he failed to mention Steevens's reprint by mere oversight.

² The Harvard copy (bound as a single volume) and one Boston Public Library copy (bound with *Romeo and Juliet*, *Hamlet*, and *Othello* as volume VIII of the *Plays and Poems*) lack a separate title-page, being provided only with the half-title "The Poems of Shakspeare." The second Boston Library copy (likewise bound with the three plays as volume VIII) also lacks a title but has bound with it a "facsimile" title-page running, "THE POEMS / OF / WILLIAM SHAKSPEARE. / == / PHILADELPHIA: / PINTED [*sic*] BY BIOREN AND MADEN [*sic*]. / / 1796. /" The facsimile is accompanied by a letter to Arthur Mason Knapp from JAMES O'NEIL (Washington, D. C., October 6, 1893), who says, "I herewith enclose you a copy of fac-simile title page of the unique first American edition of 'Shakspeares Poems' now in my possession." The general title-page of this volume is followed by a half-title, "The Plays and Poems of William Shakspeare. Volume Eighth. Containing Romeo and Juliet, Hamlet, Othello, and the Author's Poems."

had appeared in the 1640 *Poems* and the various editions based thereon) are added. Actually H. N. PAUL has discovered (WESTFALL, *American Shakespearean Criticism*, 1939, p. 88) that the Advertisement and the rest of the book are "reprinted directly from a separate [Dublin] edition issued in 1791 by William Jones, Ayscough's publisher," an edition which is itself only a reprint of Malone's 1790 text with the two additional poems mentioned above. JANE SHERZER (*P. M. L. A.*, 1907, XXII, 641 f.) notes that the added poems "follow the sonnets without title as if forming one continuous poem with them. The numbering of the sonnets is omitted, many changes in punctuation . . . and a few other evidences of editorial work appear." On the whole, the Philadelphia edition, at least when compared with Ewing's, Gentleman's, Evans's, or Oulton's, does no particular discredit to early American taste and scholarship. H. R. STEEVES (in Matthews and Thorndike, *Shaksperian Studies*, 1916, pp. 348 f.), to be sure, criticizes the whole edition for its slight and unscholarly "apparatus"; but Sherzer (p. 642) finds in it "evidence of some slight textual, philosophical, and judicial criticism."¹ It is also noteworthy that the Philadelphia editor was the jurist JOSEPH HOPKINSON (see B. A. KONKLE's biography, 1931, pp. 48-56).

Perhaps mention should also be made of three related volumes based upon Malone's 1780 edition: (1) volume VII of "*The Works of William Shakspeare, Containing His Plays and Poems; to Which Is Added a Glossary. In Seven Volumes. . . .* London: Printed for G. G. & J. Robinson, R. Faulder, B. & J. White, J. Edwards, T. Payne, Jun. J. Walker, & J. Anderson. 1797"; (2) "*The Poems of William Shakspeare: Viz. Venus and Adonis, The Rape of Lucrece, Sonnets, The Passionate Pilgrim and The Lover's Complaint, with Mr. Capell's History of the Origin of Shakspeare's Fables. To Which Is Added a Glossary. Ornamented with Three Portraits, by Bartolozzi, &c.* London: Printed for Edward Jeffery. . . . [1804?]" and (3) "*The Poetical Works of William Shakspeare. Viz. Venus and Adonis. The Rape of Lucrece. Sonnets. The Passionate Pilgrim. The Lover's Complaint. To Which Is Added a Glossary to the Whole of His Works.* London: Printed for Thomas Wilson, . . . 1806." These three are exactly the same edition² except for the varying title-pages; all bear the water-marks "1795" and "WS 1795." Capell's "History," which is inserted into the second, is printed on paper bearing the water-mark "1804."

Merely to list editions of the poems from Malone to the present day would be to compile a sizable volume. LEE remarks truly (ed. 1905, *Venus*, p. 75): "It is due to Malone's example that *Venus and Adonis* and the rest of Shakespeare's non-dramatic works were finally admitted to the Shakespearean canon. They fill a place in all the nineteenth-century editions of Shakespeare's works which enjoy a standard repute." Perhaps the most influential modern text has been that of CLARK and WRIGHT, first in the Globe (1864) and then in the Cambridge (1866, 1893) editions. Since 1866, editors have in

¹ For readings of this 1796 edition (based upon the Ayscough 1791 text) see 1.3, 2.11, 9.8, 23.10, 47.13, 48.12, 56.14, 60.1, 8, 62.12, 84.8, 99.15, 104.7, 119.1, 11, 122.7, 125.7, 127.10, 135.13, 149.3.

² For readings of this 1797 edition see 2.13, 84.13, 91.2, 93.7, 105.2, 153.12.

general tended to follow the CAMBRIDGE EDITORS; or else they have returned closer and closer to Q in spelling, grammar, and even punctuation—tendencies best represented in the work of WYNDHAM, NEILSON, BULLEN, RIDLEY, KITTREDGE, and HARRISON. The proposed Old Spelling Edition of R. B. MCKERROW, ended by his untimely death (1940), would have reproduced the text of Q more closely still.

APPENDIX II

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE 1609 TEXT

"It has never been seriously questioned," RALEIGH (*Shakespeare*, p. 87) declared in 1907, "that all the Sonnets are by Shakespeare"; but this statement was made in disregard or ignorance of the facts. Their authenticity had often been questioned seriously before 1907, it has often been questioned since, and no doubt it will be often questioned in the future. Indeed, the greatest advantage of Shakespearean studies seems to be that questions may be asked over and over again, and that almost nobody pays attention to the answers—unless he borrows them for his own use in an article or a book. Now obviously the fact that the sonnets were published in 1609 under Sh.'s name is in itself no proof whatever that he wrote them. Comparatively few scholars accept him as the author of the *L. C.*, which appeared in the same volume. Fewer still attribute to him any of the poems in the *P. P.*, "by W. Shakespeare," of 1599 and 1612 except five that occur elsewhere under his name. Hardly anyone credits him with the various plays, published with his name or initials, that make up the so-called Sh. apocrypha.

These details are all too rarely kept in mind by writers on the sonnets. They were, indeed, flatly contradicted by MURRY in 1927 (*Countries of the Mind*, 2d series, 1931, pp. 122 f.): "Our assumption . . . must be that they are Shakespeare's; and we must hold to it until it is demonstrated in each particular case that a sonnet cannot reasonably be attributed to him"; it is "necessary to presume the authenticity of the sonnets" in *Q*. But his position is illogical. On the other hand, APPLETON MORGAN (*Sh. in Fact*, 1888, p. 81) went too far in asserting, with his customary perversity, that Sh.'s "name on a title-page . . . [is] not only no proof of, but," since the publication in 1599 of the *P. P.* with his name, "actually a presumption against, his authorship." Wrong, too, is the further assertion (pp. 83 f.), "what he never claimed let us not supply to him."¹ GREENWOOD (*Sh. Problem Restated*, 1908, pp. 369 f. n.) similarly makes much of the fact (or supposed fact) that "the authorship of the Sonnets was never avowed or claimed by Shakespeare"—as it certainly was not by his own candidate Bacon. Sh. apparently "claimed" nothing but *Venus* and *Lucrece*, but scholars have on rational grounds supplied him with thirty-seven or thirty-eight plays as well as the sonnets. Yet, for all we know, he *may* have "claimed" the sonnets and by his protests, or those of his patron, have managed (as the total absence of references to *Q* between 1609 and 1640 indicates) to suppress the unauthorized edition of Thorpe (see pp. 326 f., below). It is noteworthy, however, that he did not, like Daniel and many others, use the unauthorized text as an excuse for issuing a correct text for himself; and

¹ MORGAN earlier had written (*Manhattan*, 1884, III, 441): "It is highly improbable, if not impossible, that William Shakespeare wrote those sonnets." He gave no real evidence for the statement or for his suggestion (p. 450) that probably Sh. "sold the use of his name" to Thorpe.

there is justification for W. C. HAZLITT's comment (*Shakespear*, 1902, p. 199): "The superficial assertion, that the book contains only Shakespear's work, goes for nothing; Jaggard had said the same thing" about the *P. P.* The problem of authenticity, and it is a very real problem, is generally passed over in silence by editors, critics, commentators. Hence the pronouncements of ALDEN (*Shakespear*, 1922, pp. 117 f.), SCOTT (*Sonnets élisabéthains*, 1929, p. 230), and KNIGHTS (*Scrutiny*, 1934, III, 135) are worth emphasizing. The sonnets, Alden writes, "are without authentication, and at certain points diverse authorship has been suspected; but the great number of the one hundred and fifty-four in the collection are universally accepted as Shakespeare's." Scott likewise insists that the authenticity of the sonnets has never been established, that various authors may be responsible for some, although the majority are commonly accepted as Sh.'s. The words of Knights are: "The possibility that some of the Sonnets . . . are not by Shakespeare, is not likely to be disputed on *a priori* grounds by those who are familiar with the habits of contemporary publishers and the fortunes of authors' manuscripts in the 16th and 17th centuries."

Nobody has yet made a reasoned defense of the authenticity of the sonnets, though it is perhaps true that the majority are almost "universally accepted" as Sh.'s. The assumption is based largely on diction, imagery, style in general. An early pronouncement on this matter is ESCHENBURG's (*Ueber W. Sh.*, 1787, p. 574): "The prevailing manner of writing and the similarity of so many images and expressions to passages in the poet's dramas, joined with all the external evidence, make it wholly impossible to doubt their authenticity." In similar vein CALVERT (*Shakespear*, 1879, p. 72) writes that the sonnets "of themselves suffice to shatter the shallow doubts that now and then have been started as to their authorship: no other poet of that day could have written them, so packed are they with thought, so centrally lighted with the red heat of poetry." "If the sonnets had been published anonymously," says REED (*English Lyrical Poetry*, 1912, p. 173), "their language alone would have proved Shakespeare's authorship"—though many skeptics have *not* been converted.¹ H. W. WELLS (*S. A. B.*, 1937, XII, 120) says that "attacks on his authorship have been even less frequent than convincing As able critics have gone almost out of their way to attest, the poems everywhere bear the mark of Shakspeare. . . . The best sonnets are too good to be by another hand, the worst too ingeniously perverse in badness to be by a less daring author. . . . We know these poems to be his, all marked by his unmistakable sign." Such, to be sure, is the orthodox opinion, but it is far from being the opinion of all "able critics."

Time and space are lacking to enumerate all the efforts that have been made to take the sonnets away from "the Stratford man," Sh., and to bestow their

¹ If little proof has been offered for Sh.'s authorship, none at all has been presented for that of Bacon, Raleigh, Oxford, Rutland, and the rest. Assertion, not evidence, backs their claims. THURSTON (*Month*, 1930, CLVI, 425) considers Meres's words of 1598 (see p. 53, below) sufficient to establish Sh.'s title "against all pretended rival claims," for he cannot believe that Bacon *et al.* would have allowed their sonnets to circulate in manuscript under the name of another.

authorship on another. The Baconians are, in general, fairly well known, and hence may be ignored here in favor of a few more picturesque heretics.

The belief that FRANCIS BACON was the author has itself undergone many modifications. REICHEL's theory in 1887 (*Sh.-Litteratur*), to illustrate, was that around 1586 there died a great atheistic poet-playwright-philosopher named William Sh. He was the composer of the plays, the sonnets (but not necessarily the other poems), and the philosophic works now attributed to Bacon. That rascal, by hook or crook, obtained possession of all the manuscripts. In connivance (pp. 475 f.) with Jonson, he found a Stratford namesake of the dead author, one William Sh., who agreed to father the various compositions; but, as they were not in their final form, the dilettante Bacon was obliged to rewrite them. Hence everything that is bad, weak, banal in the plays and sonnets may confidently be assigned to his hand. REICHEL threw overboard this ingenious theory when in 1902 (*Gegenwart*, LXII, 250 f.) he came to realize that only a few of the sonnets were written by Bacon, the majority by the first and second earls of ESSEX. In the meantime, T. W. WHITE (*Our English Homer*, 1892, p. 291) had solemnly described them as "the production of Anthony and Francis Bacon and some of the friends of Francis."

As long ago as August, 1852, R. W. JAMESON (see R. Cochrane, *T. L. S.*, April 20, 1916, p. 189) suggested (*Chambers's Edinburgh Journal*, XVIII, 87-89) that Sh. found in a London garret "some pale, wasted student . . . with eyes of genius gleaming through despair," from whom he purchased the plays and poems, "thereafter keeping his poet, as Mrs Packwood did." Though Jameson failed to accept his own suggestion, adaptations of it have frequently since bobbed up as facts, not imagination. Thus JESSE JOHNSON (*Testimony*, 1899) declared that the sonnets were written to, not by, Sh., who (p. 97) probably "was the friend or patron around whom their poetry moves and to whom most of them are addressed." They (pp. 98 f.) "reveal another poet, and reveal that those great dramas, or at least that those portions of them which are in the same class or grade of poetry as the Sonnets, were the work of that great unknown."

To the mind of G. S. CALDWELL (*Is Sir Walter Raleigh the Author of Sh.'s Plays and Sonnets?*, 1877, pp. 29 f.) 71-74 "afford proof than which nothing could be stronger of the identification of Raleigh as the author. . . . These sonnets were addressed by Raleigh to his wife when he was lying under sentence of death in 1603"; "the 'surly sullen bell,' which tolls at the execution of criminals, indicates the circumstances under which he was to die. Equally plain is the allusion to the axe and the executioner" in 74.10 f. To his lameness RALEIGH refers in 37 and 89. ROBERT PALK (*T. L. S.*, April 20, 1916, p. 189) apparently made his discovery of Raleigh's authorship independently. Sir Walter, he tells us, "was lame: in 1596 he wrote that all he had got from the sack of Cadiz was a 'lame leg and a deformed.' As Captain of the Guard he held a high post at Court, his 'extern' displaying . . . a suit of silver armour," and so on. 107 is his welcome to his wife, who joined him in the Tower about April, 1604.

STOTSENBURG (*Baconiana*, October, 1892, pp. 53-61) reached the conclusion (warmly seconded by W. THEOBALD, *On the Authorship of the Sonnets*, 1896) that, whoever wrote the plays and poems, SIDNEY was the author of the sonnets.

The latter abound in unmistakable references to Dyer and Lady Rich. Furthermore, in 136 Sidney says, "My name is *Will*"—a name known to be his by the (greatly disputed) allusion to him as "our pleasant Willy" in Spenser's *Tears of the Muses*, 1591, lines 205–210, and by his (undoubted) appearance as "Willy" in Davison's *Poetical Rhapsody*, 1602 (ed. Rollins, 1931, I, 39–44). Later on, STOTSENBURG (*Impartial Study*, 1904, p. 222) rejected the claims of ANTHONY SHIRLEY to the sonnets and (pp. 232–251), having awarded to Sh. the poems and plays generally attributed to him, pointed out similarities of style in Sidney's acknowledged works and the sonnets that prove Sidney the author of both. As this revolutionary thesis demands that everything in Q must have been written before October 17, 1586, literary history is considerably upset.

For reasons of the same kind and weight LATHAM DAVIS (*Sh. England's Ulysses*, 1905) discerned in the sequence a masque of five acts written by the second LORD ESSEX and disarranged by Thorpe. On the other hand, HAROLD JOHNSON (*Did the Jesuits Write "Sh."?*, 1916) in (p. 3) "an unusual Judicial Proceeding which promises to become historic" announced to the Judges of the Cook County, Illinois, Circuit Court his discovery that the sonnets and other works wrongly attributed to Sh. were actually written and published by (p. 8) "certain members of the Society of Jesus . . . living in seclusion in England at the time," and that (p. 17) the pseudonym "Sh." was suggested by the name of Nicholas Breakspear, or Pope Adrian IV. JACQUES BOULENGER (*L'Affaire Sh.*, 1919, p. 70), an adherent of the sixth EARL OF DERBY, admits that 36, 110, 111 seem to refer to an actor, but of course the moment that "William Stanley wished to pass for William Shakespeare, he had to speak like William Shakespeare and not like William Stanley." A word may be given, also, to PETER ALVOR (BURKHARD HERRMANN), who in 1906 (*Das neue Sh.-Evangelium*) founded the Rutland-"Sh." theory, proving (2d ed., 1907, p. 118) that Southampton wrote all the histories and tragedies except *Hamlet*, *Troilus and Cressida*, and *Timon*, and Roger Manners, fifth EARL OF RUTLAND, all the other plays as well as the poems and the sonnets. Rutland won disciples in BLEIBTREU (*Der wahre Sh.*, 3d ed., 1907; *Sh.s Geheimnis*, 1923), CELESTIN DEMBLON (*Lord Rutland est Sh.*, 1912), and KARL SCHNEIDER (*Neues Zeugnis für Rutland-Sh.*, 1932); but in 1911 (*Lösung des Sh.-Problems*) ALVOR discarded the new theory to advance a newer, that ANTHONY BACON was "Sh." By 1930 (*Neue Sh.-Biographie*) ALVOR was proving that Sh. was Charles Blount, LORD MOUNTJOY, subsequently EARL OF DEVONSHIRE, the lover and later the husband of Sidney's Stella. His proof is engaging. It consists (as EDUARD ECKHARDT, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1931 [LII, 649 f.], remarks) of such trustworthy details as that Sh. was taciturn, Mountjoy was taciturn; therefore Sh. equals Mountjoy. On evidence as valuable as the foregoing FINCH BARNARD (*Science and the Soul*, 1918, p. 13; see also his *More Light on Sh.*, 1914) established "that the author of Shakespeare was one of the Barnards" of Akenham or Abington, and told previously undreamed-of news about the sonnets.

The contributions to romance of PHILLIPS have been summarized elsewhere.¹ He lists (*Sunlight on Sh.'s Sonnets*, 1935, pp. 185–192) as ten sonnets of doubtful authorship (that is, as doubtfully LORD OXFORD's: none is Sh.'s)

¹ See pp. 275 f., below.

20, 126, 128, 130, 131, 138, 145, 151, 153, 154. Then in *Lord Burghley in Sh.*, 1936 (pp. 223-241), he pointed out three Sh.'s: the great Sh. (Oxford), who wrote the sonnets and "all the genuine plays"; Will. Sh., his son, hero of the sonnets; and William Sh. of Stratford, "the dummy." I forbear to summarize his "proof." With similar forbearance (see pp. 227 f., below) I am content only to mention the picturesque and imaginative contention of WILLIAM ROSS, Fellow of the Royal Institute of British Architects (*Story of Anne Whateley and William Shaxpere*, 1939), that (pp. 11, 231) "the great unknown genius," "the greatest literary genius of all time," who wrote the sonnets and plays (as well as many other falsely attributed Elizabethan works, including [p. 230] *Hero and Leander* and *The Faery Queen*) "was Anne Whateley of Hillborough in the Parish of Temple Grafton, Warwickshire. Her name is preserved in Bishop Whitgift's register at Worcester. An entry, dated 27th November, 1582, records that a licence was granted for a marriage between William Shaxpere and Anne Whateley . . . [but it] did not take place."

To ALDEN BROOKS (*Will Sh. Factotum*, 1937) "Sh." is a pseudonym, and Q (p. 316) a collection of "sonnets, that . . . expressed the Poet's personal moods and thoughts; sonnets that the Poet wrote in jest as coming from Will Shakspeare; sonnets that . . . Nashe, Daniel, Barnes, wrote for Will Shakspeare; sonnets that other poets wrote in their own name; sonnets . . . written by Southampton . . . ; and sonnets . . . added by some editorial hand." That there is absolutely no evidence to support any of his statements disturbed neither Brooks nor his publishers. Among the former's attributions are 16 to DANIEL, 20, 38, 80, 85, 86 to BARNES, 14, 82-84, 135, 136 to NASHE, and 121, 122, 148 to SOUTHAMPTON. After six further years of studious cogitation BROOKS (*Will Sh. and the Dyer's hand*, 1943) reiterated these views, identifying "the Poet," formerly anonymous, as SIR EDWARD DYER (1543-1607). He now considers (p. 639) the reference in 111.7 to "the Dyers hand" (see p. 229 n., below) very significant indeed.

The theory of multiple authorship so fervidly supported by Brooks is old. It has been argued for by many people who look with scorn on the non-Stratfordians. For example, in 1835 RICHARDSON (*G. M.*, n. s., IV, 369) hazarded the suggestion that "perhaps some two or three of them are the [p]roduction of an inferior pen." "If I understand . . . [20] rightly," he had written (p. 363), "it is in every respect a disgrace to the name of Shakspeare. (And yet how can we know that it is really his?)." The multiple-authorship notion, developed by MASSEY in 1866 (see pp. 88-90, below), converted KRAUSS (*Jahrbuch*, 1881, XVI, 205) to the belief that Pembroke collected the sonnets and turned them over to Thorpe, with the result that several, like 145 and 153 (plus the *L. C.*), not of Sh.'s composition got into Q. "The fact," Krauss continues, "that the sonnets form a cycle makes the matter all the more suspicious; for this was achieved only when the editor added the intermediate poem 126 to the first division (14x9) and 145, which is not a sonnet, to the second division of twenty-eight sonnets. Thus, despite the unrelatedness of the various sonnets, he achieved a total of 154 (14x11)—a *sonnet cycle*, in which he threw dust in his readers' eyes! Only too probably something was smuggled in which was not at all Sh.'s." The Massey-Krauss theory won the allegiance of MACKAY (*Nineteenth Century*, 1884, XVI, 238): "Editor after editor, commentator after commentator, critic after critic, has accepted them with blind

unquestioning faith as the undoubted work of . . . [Sh.], and gone into raptures accordingly." But Sh. "never published them, never claimed their authorship, never acknowledged them, and never . . . gave his consent or authority to any one else to publish them on his behalf, or in his name." Such reasoning as this would deprive Sh. of all his plays. But convinced of its soundness, Mackay goes on to show (pp. 245-251) that MARLOWE was the author of 30, 37, 38, 40, 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, 89-91, 110-113 and PEMBROKE of 34-36, 127-144, 151, 152.

The theory that two or more authors are represented in Q has never been downed, and indeed today comparatively few scholars reject its possibility or probability. Many favor more than two authors. SHINDLER (*G. M.*, 1892, CCLXXII, 78), for example, writes, "It is possible that many of the Sonnets . . . are not" Sh.'s, especially 145 and 151. YEATMAN (*Gentle Sh.*, 1896, pp. 295-297), brushing aside objections, says that Sh. did not compose 127-154, "which are obviously addressed to an abandoned woman." They are like BARTHOLOMEW GRIFFIN's work. Not even all of 1-126 are Sh.'s: "40 and 41 seem interposed." Q, then, is an anthology, to which probable contributors were Griffin, the antiquary HENRY FERRARS (or FERRERS, 1549-1633), and the EARLS OF DERBY,¹ SOUTHAMPTON, and PEMBROKE. STRONACH (*N. & Q.*, August 22, 1903, p. 142) also describes Q as a miscellany resembling the enlarged *P. P.* of 1612—"a collection of verses by various hands," one being BARNABE BARNES, who wrote 86. With more restraint ACHESON (*Sh. and the Rival Poet*, 1903, p. 10) calls 145 "undoubtedly the work of another hand" (he gives no proof), a statement that puts the stamp of authenticity on all the rest. DOUGLAS (*True History*, 1933, pp. 213 f.) likewise rejects 145 from the Sh. canon simply because it seems to him "feeble stuff."

Far different was the verdict rendered by EICHHOFF (*Unser Sh.*, 1903), who looked upon Q as a poetical anthology of little value. Quite possibly (II, 44 f.) it "contains not a single line by Shakespeare," though probably it does have "a certain number of the poet's genuine productions, which, with other sonnets, were brought together in a book by the publisher." One thing is certain: it is impossible to prove Shakespeare's authorship for all the sonnets or even for any one of them. "The only thing we can say is this: If Shakespeare wrote these sonnets or a part of them, then it is in the highest degree probable that truly great poems will be found in the volume." Certainly it would be a great injustice to Sh. if we attributed wretched compositions to him without absolute certainty. "*We cannot ascertain who wrote these sonnets. There remains only the question of the value of these productions.*" Eichhoff next expresses his intention of separating "the good and useful sonnets from the useless." Only sixteen stand forth so far above the rest that one may say, "They differ from the others as day from night." These sixteen "jewels" are, in an order that "pleases" him, 116, 29, 71, 110, 109, 27, 52, 76, 44, 75, 97, 91, 105, 115, 111, 129. Unfortunately (p. 63), "whether these sixteen sonnets really belong to Shakespeare cannot be determined." Only the possibility of his authorship has been found. "Whoever is not a very intimate friend" of Sh.'s will not be able to do much with the poet's sonnets. But from an intimate friend like Eichhoff Sh.'s ghost might well pray to be delivered.

¹ Presumably Ferdinando Stanley (1559-1594), the fifth earl.

Though all men make faults and kill the thing they love, it is painful to see the contempt for "unser Sh." that results in Eichhoff's sprinkling the verses with superfluous and impertinent *sic*'s and exclamation points, as (p. 92) "Beated (!) and chopp'd (!) with tann'd (!) antiquity" (62.10). ROBERTSON (*Problems*, 1926, pp. 55 f.) quotes "the veteran critic" as having written to him in 1923 that "if one really penetrates into their content and their form," the sixteen jewels "make the perusal of the other sonnets an impossibility"; and then goes on to say that "Eichhoff's tests are ethico-psychic, though he would also claim that as such they are literary. But when we note that he acclaims 29 but drops 30; takes 44 but ignores 45, which connects with it; puts aside so beautiful a Sonnet as 73, with 74, which connects with it, yet adopts 75; gives honour to 115, yet drops 107, what can be said save that his subjective preferences are incompatible with those of most other students of all countries? . . . On the other hand, the consensus of criticism in praise of a number of the Sonnets which Dr. Eichhoff dismisses as valueless is such as to make his selection a mere ukase, in which *stat pro ratione voluntas*. When we come to attempt for ourselves a discrimination of authorship in terms of technique, purport, and diction, his pronouncement will, unfortunately, hinder rather than help us." In contrast to Eichhoff's devastation KELLER (*Sh.'s Werke*, 1916, XV, 112) considers only 153 and 154 as perhaps spurious, while POOLER (ed. 1918, pp. xxxiv, 23, 125, 137) impugns the genuineness of 20, 127, 128, 145, 153, and 154.¹

From the Civil Service of India comes the work of FORREST (*Five Authors*, 1923), who fears (p. 7) that his solution of the problem will "be found dull and unromantic." The second adjective is inappropriate. His first perusals of the sonnets (p. 11) led him to believe twenty genuine—1-3, 18, 26, 29, 33, 34, 64, 66, 73, 74, 78, 79, 102, 106, 132, 143, 144, 146; but after further study he rejected (pp. 180, 184 f.) 146 and possibly 66, and added (pp. 24, 38, 96, 150, 156, 160) thirteen sonnets—11, 19, 40, 88-90, 109, 110, 116, 120, 140, 148, 150. The remaining one hundred twenty-odd are with unwavering self-confidence distributed among BARNABE BARNES, WILLIAM WARNER, JOHN DONNE, SAMUEL DANIEL, and SOUTHAMPTON. Such airy redistribution keeps Sh. from the shame of being the author (p. 226) of 22, 28, 38, 46, 51, and others of "variegated vileness." But just a year later TUCKER (ed. 1924, pp. li, lxi) characterizes only "one or two," including 145 and 151, as unauthentic.

EDUARD SIEVERS (*Anglica*, 1925, II, 203-206) resumed the work of destruction. "The sonnets," he writes, "are not uniform. To type S (=Shakespeare) belong nos. 1-18, 22-32, 62-137, 145-149, 152. In the beginning there is a variation between S^b|S^a [Sh.'s two voices]; thereafter S^b dominates, a fact which demonstrates the isolation of each sonnet." 19-21, 33-61, 138-144, 150, 151, 153, 154 are congruous according to voice, and hence were probably written by one poet, who is called X. He is further distinguished from Sh. because he reproduces lines 1-12 of each sonnet in his normal voice, with ascending rime, and lines 13 and 14 in his altered voice, with descending rime; whereas Sh. does exactly the opposite. Distinct grammatical differences are also present. Internally both groups doubtless belong together; in fact individual elements in both clearly refer to each other. Hence "one may think

¹ But in his 1931 edition (p. xxxiv) he does not challenge 127.

of an interchange of sonnets or a sonnet-contest between Shakespeare and the young friend to whom so many of the (Shakespearean!) sonnets are addressed. If he is identical with our X, he is far beyond Shakespeare in sensual sultriness. Might he not therefore have been the one who incited the entire sonnet relationship," and who is "the onlie begetter" of Thorpe's dedication?

The most determined—and scholarly—attacks on the sonnets have been those of ROBERTSON. In *Sh. and Chapman*, 1917 (pp. 10-12), he expressed doubts of the genuineness of 5, 35, 128, 129, 135, 136, 143, 145, 153, 154. Indeed, "if one alien piece could be included in the bundle [Q], others [like 125] might be." Then in 1926 (*Problems*) this master disintegrator tore Q to pieces in great style. He ridiculed (*Genuine in Sh.*, 1930, p. 63) the "blind assumption . . . that the visibly unauthorised publication by one printer fixes the whole for ever on Shakespeare, who never acknowledged them, and who probably got the edition suppressed"; and stressed the likelihood that *Shake-speares Sonnets* is not a publisher's title but one written by Sir William Hervey (see pp. 219-221, below) in an album "for the first sonnets to Southampton. Other sonnets by Shakespeare, and sonnets by other men," were added, "with blank pages between sets." This hypothesis may, or may not, please adherents of Southampton as the friend; disbelievers in Southampton will protest that it begs the question. Probably no one, says Robertson (p. 62), "ascribes *every* sonnet to Shakespeare. That he wrote about a hundred of the 154 is a reasoned estimate." It is far from clear what sonnets the critic does reject, for he indulges in numerous contradictions and vague statements.¹ But from his summary (*Problems*, 1926, pp. 261-270), apparently he believes, on grounds of inferior style, that Sh. cannot have written 18, 20, 24, 27, 28, 31, 32, 43-47, 50, 51, 53-55, 61-63, 67, 69, 70, 77, 79, 81, 87, 91, 94, 99, 100, 101, 103, 105, 113-115, 118, 122, 125, 126, 128-131, 133-136, 142, 143, 145, 151, 153, 154—or fifty-five in all.

Robertson's destructive criterion is purely subjective. LEE (*Life*, 1898, p. 87) had said, without enumerating a single one of the sonnets, that "many sink almost into inanity beneath the burden of quibbles and conceits." These "many," like a runner, he took in his stride; whereas Robertson, to the displeasure of MURRY, 1927 (*Countries of the Mind*, 2d series, 1931, p. 122), feels "free to deny to Shakespeare any sonnet . . . which may strike us as inferior to our chosen best." Interestingly enough, T. S. ELIOT (*Nation and Aethnaeum*, 1927, XL, 664, 666) is "predisposed" to accept Robertson's findings. "I should not venture myself to disagree about more than a very few" of the rejected sonnets, he confesses. But in general scholarly and critical opinion has been opposed. So NICOLL (*M. L. R.*, 1927, XXII, 332) observed that Q "professed to be Shakespeare's, and . . . there is at present no real justification for believing it unauthentic. It may have been; but may-be's, in literary criticism, are useless." J. D. WILSON (*Monthly Criterion*, 1927, VI, 166) answered that Sh. need not "have always been at the top of his form"; and that if, for example, 27 is bad, Sh.'s authorship is not in question, for its "flatness . . . is simply evidence for the truth of the situation which it depicts."

¹ As in *Problems*, 1926, p. 269, after he has rejected fourteen, the statement that he has set aside "more than half of the twenty-eight Sonnets" in 127-154; and on p. 270 that he has relieved Sh. "of fifty-odd more or less bad Sonnets."

Sh. wrote sonnets "in more than one style," Wilson said, and some of those to which Robertson objects may be parodies. This last notion of parody is enforced by PRAZ (*English Studies*, 1928, X, 25 f.), who recognizes no merit in Robertson's opinions: "A book consisting solely of first-rate pieces would be anomalous, artificial, possibly the result of a selection. That natural rule of economy accounts for the inferior pieces in a better way than any possible theory of collective work." KELLER (*Jahrbuch*, 1928, LXIV, 197 f.) dismisses Robertson as arbitrary and subjective; and acrimoniously DOUGLAS (*True History*, 1933, p. 66) comments that, as in Robertson's rejections are 54 and 55, sonnets "among the finest that Shakespeare has written, I think it is waste of time to argue with him or to take any notice whatever of his fantastic opinions." Robertson's discussion is clever, provocative, and superficially convincing. But admittedly he bases his decisions on some vague, or at any rate unformulated, standard of taste and literary perfection. Why should all Sh.'s sonnets be equally good? Wordsworth, the perfect sonneteer of 1803, wrote the deplorable River Duddon, Ecclesiastical, and Capital Punishment sequences. Personal taste is a dangerous guide: so many men, so many tastes.

It is perhaps scarcely worth while to give heed to a man who has written a book arguing that *Hamlet* had nine actor-authors; yet MARSCHALL's *Aus Sh.s poetischem Briefwechsel*, 1926, takes the cake (or one of the cakes) for incoherent and muddled expression. His meaning—so far as I can make it out—seems to be that two unknown poets,¹ "R." and "W." (p. 5), "for certain reasons published some of their poems under the name of *William Shakespeare*, a man engaged in the theater-business." W. (pp. 19, 25) wrote *Venus*, R. *Lucrece*. They collaborated in the so-called *Shake-speare's Sonnets* of 1609, their poetical correspondence, which is analyzed in a fashion passing belief. Marschall's contributions are evidently esteemed by German philological journals. In the *Beiblatt*, 1928 (XXXIX, 99-102), he turned a review of Bray (ed. 1925) into an argument that the *thou*-sonnets were composed by the younger poet, the author of *Lucrece* (R.), the *you*-sonnets by the older, the author of *Venus* (W.). In 1929 (*E. S.*, LXIII, 334 f.) he developed once more his ideas of double authorship on the basis of the use of *thou* and *you*. In fairness one must note that ELISE DECKNER (*Beiblatt*, 1927, XXXVIII, 248-253) rejects "this sort of Shakespeare literature emphatically." She supposes that by W. Marschall means Sh., but disclaims all knowledge of R. and the rival poet G. Deckner assumes—wrongly, I imagine—that Marschall's purpose is "to depreciate Shakespeare as man and as poet."

With Robertson in view FORT (*Library*, December, 1928, p. 308) remarks, "I think it improper to reject any sonnets solely on the ground that they are inferior to others in quality." MACKAIL, however (*Approach to Sh.*, 1930, p. 116), says that of 127-154 the last two are certainly not Sh.'s, while eight others (not specified) are "*dubia vel spuria*," but that some of 1-126 have been questioned "on very inadequate grounds" except for 20 (see its introductory notes). CHAMBERS (*William Sh.*, 1930, I, 561), though Robertson's most prominent

¹ EBISCH and SCHÜCKING (*Sh. Bibliography*, 1931, p. 268) identify them as Bacon and Rutland.

antagonist, concedes that doubts are perhaps justifiable about the genuineness of 128, 135, 136, 143, 145, 153, and 154.

STAINER's attention (*T. L. S.*, April 7, 1932, p. 250) was attracted to 76.4-9, the initial letters of which are T, W, A, T, S, O. In the light of line 7, "That euery word doth almoft fel [always changed by editors to *tell*] my name," they suggested to him the name and authorship of THOMAS WATSON, and the possibility that Sh. "dressed up old material [of Watson's] that came into his hands, or that Thorpe got somebody else to do so." Watson is described (compare 37.9) as poor and lame.

In the course of a series of imaginary conversations between "Sam" Coleridge and Charles Lamb, STALKER (*Sh. and Tom Nashe*, 1935) deprives Sh. of seventy-one sonnets, which seem to be 4, 6-11, 14, 17, 20, 22, 24, 26-28, 34-47, 53, 55, 63, 72, 79, 81, 83, 92, 96, 100, 101, 103, 113, 114, 126-128, 130-154. Of the non-Shakespearean sonnets in 1-125, all but 20 and probably 55 (see pp. 59-61, 65 f.) are by the rival poet NASHE, whose work is distinguished (p. 15) by "unreal matter, poetic incompetence, ludicrous reasoning, . . . pedestrian images and mere prose, silly alliterations . . . , clumsy rhymes." But 126-154 are (p. 38) "a miscellaneous collection by a variety of authors," all of whom probably belonged to the circle of Southampton or that of Nashe. The latter wrote only two sonnets in this series, 133 and 134. His total in Q is apparently forty-three or forty-four, that of the miscellaneous poets twenty-seven or twenty-eight, Sh.'s eighty-three. The eighty-three, except for 129, occur in the first series; some (p. 15) are "sublime," all are "sensible"; and as they have none of Nashe's stylistic peculiarities, they may safely be credited to Sh.

Not depreciation but appreciation of Sh. is the motive behind WALTER THOMSON's recent book (*Sonnets of William Sh.*, 1938). In reading the poems it became clear to him (pp. 39, 48) "that not one, but two personalities were involved," that some have Sh.'s "characteristic, confident utterance," others "an air of youthful inexperience and diffidence." For reasons not entirely evident—and certainly illogical—he decides that Sh. wrote (p. v) "only about one hundred of the Sonnets" in the first series (1-126). The other twenty-six—32, 36, 38, 39, 43-45, 47, 48, 50-52, 58, 59, 61, 62, 72, 74, 101, 105, 109, 114, 117, 118, 121, 122—were composed by SOUTHAMPTON. Sh. "had very little or no hand" in 127-154. Indeed (pp. 57 f.) Southampton "wrote or collected that series . . . in large degree"; but neither he nor Sh. can be held responsible for "some of the rubbish" therein. The "rubbish" came from the pen of DANIEL (a versifier inferior to Southampton), who almost certainly wrote 129 and 146. Much more conservatively WOLFGANG SCHMIDT (*Anglia*, 1938, LXII, 286) describes 126 and 145 as certainly and 26, 55, and 99 as probably not genuine.

Even this rapid and incomplete survey shows that the "disintegrators" profess to be, and no doubt are, motivated by admiration for Sh. Thus ROBERTSON (*Problems*, 1926, p. 278): "To claim for the master-poet some ninety-six, or possibly a round hundred, Sonnets which grade between the partly charming and the wholly fine, is surely to do better service to him and to literary history than to insist bibliolatrously on loading him with a whole miscellany of which many are unsuccessfully laboured, a number cacophonous,

and some absurd." In the words of STALKER (*Sh. and Tom Nashe*, 1935, pp. 9 f.), "The attribution of all the sonnets to Shakespeare is a dishonour done by his countrymen to a great poet and a good man, and dishonours Britain more than him." Unluckily for their thesis, the doubters cannot agree on what the "bad" sonnets are, even though they have proved to their own satisfaction that Sh. could have written few, if any, of the one hundred fifty-four in Q.

Some of the anti-Stratfordians are vexed by the tendency of their fellow travelers to strip borrowed beauties from their excessively self-effacing, pseudonymous authors. Thus RENDALL (*Sh. Sonnets*, 1930, p. 76) complains indignantly that the sonnets "almost at random . . . are assigned piecemeal to different authors," instead of to LORD OXFORD only. If any believer in the real Sh., the Stratford man, is distressed by the insidious Eichhoff-Forrest-Robertson-Stalker habit of plucking beautifying feathers from an upstart crow, possibly he may be comforted—or edified—in reading the various other poems and oddly constructed sonnets in *Sh.'s Revelations by Sh.'s Spirit*, 1919, and *Jesus' Teachings by Sh.s' [sic] Spirit*, 1922, American works taken by SARAH SHATFORD "to a spirit's dictation, direct voice. Proved scientifically by messages from the dead (so-called)."¹ If the sonnets in the 1609 quarto abide our question, Shatford's are free. Nobody will ever seek to attribute *them* to Oxford, Derby, the Bacons, Pembroke, Devonshire, Sidney, Raleigh, Rutland, and the rest of the mob of Elizabethan "Sh.s" who professedly wrote with the greatest ease.

¹ Compare BAB in *Die Literatur*, 1927, XXIX, 262 f.: he pretends to have found in the papers of a dead scientific friend certain verses, including "Ein Sonett Nach Sh." ("Noch einmal Liebe!? Lang begrabner Gott"), and he asks whether there can be translations of non-existent originals.

APPENDIX III

THE DATE OF COMPOSITION

The question when the sonnets were written is in many respects the most important of all the unanswerable questions they pose. If it could be answered definitely and finally, there might be some chance of establishing to general satisfaction the identity of the friend, the dark woman, the rival poet (supposing that all were real individuals), of deciding what contemporary English sources Sh. did or did not use, and even of determining whether the order of Q is the author's or not. In the past and at present such a solution has been and remains an idle dream. Evidence that at least some of the sonnets were written early in Sh.'s literary career is reasonably sound; but it does not necessarily apply to the entire collection. The dates to be set for the sequence depend on one's opinion of other matters fully as uncertain as the dates themselves.

Little information worth considering was produced by the early editors and commentators. MALONE (ed. 1780, p. 581), indeed, gave two reasons for thinking all the sonnets "written many years before" 1609—the Meres reference of 1598 (see below) and the probability that Daniel's sonnets, 1592, were "the model that Shakspeare followed." He saw (p. 608) in 32.10-14 confirmation of his belief that the sonnets "were among our author's earliest compositions."¹ GEORGE CHALMERS (*Supplemental Apology*, 1799, pp. 42 n., 74 n.) merely assumed the date to be 1596 or 1597, and OULTON (ed. 1804, II, 179) duplicated Malone's statement that the sonnets were written "many years before" they were printed. According to DRAKE (*Sh. and His Times*, 1817, II, 50 f.), internal evidence points to the years 1592-1609,² but "by far the greater part" belong to 1599-1609. In contrast Y. J. (*New Monthly Magazine*, 1823, VII, 470, 473) described them as Sh.'s very last compositions, "written, perhaps, during his retirement at Stratford-on-Avon," or, presumably, in 1608-1609; while, in Germany, TIECK (*Buch über Sh.*, ed. Henry Lüdeke, 1920, p. 438; see also *Penelope Taschenbuch*, 1826, p. 338) about 1821 relegated them to Sh.'s "second period," 1592-1601.

A few facts are available, even if their significance has been continuously disputed: (1) In *Palladis Tamia*, 1598, sigs. 201^v-202, a book licensed for publication on September 7, Francis Meres remarked: "As the soule of *Euphorbus* was thought to liue in *Pythagoras*: so the sweete wittie soule of *Ouid* liues in mellifluous & hony-tongued *Shakespeare*, witnes his *Venus* and *Adonis*, his *Lucrece*, his sugred Sonnets among his priuate friends, &c." (2) In the unauthorized *P. P.*, 1599, William Jaggard first printed two of the sonnets, 138 and 144. (3) On January 3, 1600 (Arber, *Transcript*, 1876, III, 153), Eleazar Edgar entered at Stationers' Hall "A booke called *Amours* by J D. with *certen oy^r sonnetes* by W S." (4) On May 20, 1609 (the same, p. 410), Thorpe secured a license for the publication of Q; and evidently it was published shortly there-

¹ See also STEEVENS's note to 16.10.

² On p. 70 he dates them 1594-1609.

after, for in a document of June 19 the celebrated actor Edward Alleyn (G. F. Warner, *Catalogue of the Dulwich College MSS.*, 1881, p. 72) noted under "Howshowld stuff" his purchase of "a book. Shaksper sonetts 5^d."

The foregoing facts establish a terminus of May, 1609, for the composition of the sonnets, but throw little light on the initial date; and their meaning has been subjected to contradictory explanations. Some interpreters have presumed that Meres referred to all the sonnets of Q; others, to merely a part; still others, to sonnets that have not survived. BOADEN (*On the Sonnets*, 1837, pp. 53 f.) held the last opinion: no doubt before 1598 Sh. had written and circulated sugared sonnets among his friends, but it is doubtful whether those in Q "were ever seen by any eye but *his* [Pembroke's], to whom 126 of them were addressed; they are entirely *personal*, and never intended for the public view." HAZLITT (ed. 1852, p. 452) commented: Meres's words "may only apply to some of them, or even to other short poems of our author"—not an improbable suggestion when one recalls how loosely the word *sonnet* was used by the Elizabethans. DONNELLY (*Sonnets of Sh.*, 1859, p. 7), later a prominent Baconian, remarked that the verses referred to by Meres "were 'Sonnets among his [Sh.'s] friends,' these [in Q] were all addressed to two persons." MINTO (*Characteristics*, 1874, pp. 275 f.) went further, declaring that Meres had in mind not Q but the *P. P.*, the sonnets and other lyrics in which "may with sufficient propriety be said to be animated by the sweet witty soul of Ovid." Besides, "'among his private friends' cannot be taken to mean 'to his private friend,' " Pembroke.

Incidentally, *sugred* has caused lively discussion. According to WILLIAM ARCHER (*Fortnightly*, 1897, LXVIII, 819), "it does not follow that the sonnets Meres had in mind have come down to us; but his epithet applies so accurately to the earlier sonnets in particular that it seems an excess of scepticism to doubt this. On the other hand, it is almost equally probable that a large number of the sonnets were written after the appearance of Meres's book." LEE (*Life*, 1898, p. 179 n.) explains that *sugred*, "or some synonym, is the conventional epithet applied at the date to Shakespeare and his work." MORSBACH (*Göttingen Nachrichten*, 1915, pp. 136-144) decides that it has no reference to content. From Chaucer to Milton, he continues, words like *sugared*, *sweet*, *honey-tongued*, and *mellifluous* are the common epithets applied to choice, refined language—the elegant style in rhetoric and poetry; they might even be applied to "conceited style," in which many sonnets are written. Similarly CHRISTOPHER MORLEY (Sh.'s *Complete Works*, 1936, p. xi) writes: "By 'sugared' I think an Elizabethan would mean not only sweet but spun into fantastic and diletante confectionery shapes." The revelation of EAGLE, a Baconian, is (*New Light*, 1916, p. 40) that Meres wrote, not about any of the poems in Q, but about "commendatory Sonnets sent from one individual to another, and written in sugared ink, so that the writing would shine." EAGLE repeated this baseless explanation in 1923 (*Saturday Review*, CXXXVI, 218) and 1925 (*Quest*, XVI, 509), maintaining that none of the sonnets Meres had in mind has survived unless "under other names." BAB (*Shakespeare*, 1925, pp. 205 f.) cannot conceive of anyone's describing the great sonnets of Q as "sugared," and hence refuses to admit that many were in existence in 1598.

The two *P. P.* sonnets, 138 and 144, seem to many readers to disclose the end

of the sonnet story, dealing as they do with its most important figures, the faithless friend and the equally faithless dark mistress. Those who believe the arrangement of Q to be chronological, the handiwork of the author, may well argue that by 1599 all the sonnets had been completed. But not everybody accepts 144 as a late composition. ROLFE (ed. 1905, pp. 38 f.), for example, vigorously rebukes such "a misinterpretation": 144, "instead of marking the end of the story, really belongs to a comparatively early stage of it. . . . The poet says that the woman 'tempteth' (not, has succeeded in seducing) his friend. She 'would corrupt' him, but whether she has actually done it, he adds, '*Suspect* I may, yet not directly tell,' and 'I *guess* one angel in another's hell;' but he does not 'know' this, and will 'live in doubt' until the affair comes to an end. But in . . . 34 and 35 he had no doubt that the 'woman coloured ill' had corrupted his 'better angel.'" Many other writers, for one reason or another, prolong the incidents of the sonnet story well beyond 1599.

As for the third fact, Edgar's entry of "*Certain other sonnets* by W. S.," the pronouncements of Sh.'s two eminent modern biographers may be weighed. LEE (*Life*, 1915, p. 672) tells us: "It is doubtful if Edgar's venture concerned Shakespeare's 'Sonnets.' It is more probable that his 'W. S.' was William Smith, who had published a collection of sonnets entitled 'Chloris' in 1596." ADAMS (*Life*, 1923, pp. 166 f.) replies: "It has been customary for scholars to assume that the entry referred to a hypothetical cycle by William Smith, whose . . . *Chloris* had been issued in 1596. But there is no evidence that Smith composed a second cycle, and no reason why the entry may not refer to Shakespeare's *Sonnets*. If the entry really concerned Shakespeare's collection, as seems at least possible, it is significant that the publisher did not proceed with his undertaking." Who shall decide, when doctors disagree?

The fourth fact, the date when Q was licensed, has so far remained unchallenged.¹ But the other three hardly make a firm foundation for the numberless elaborate skyscrapers that have been erected upon them.

To be sure, further evidence of a sort has been drawn upon, but with no marked success. So CORNEY (*N. & Q.*, February 1, 1862, p. 87) notes that in the *Lucrece* dedication of 1594 Sh. told Southampton, "VVhat I haue done is yours, what I haue to doe is yours," and asks, "Did he forget this promise? I must either tax him with ingratitude, or assume that he wrote the sonnets as the fulfilment of that promise." They fall between 1594 and 1598; "at a later date he had other . . . occupations." FLEAY (*Biographical Chronicle*, 1891, II, 211) for the same reason informs us that all the sonnets were "certainly written" after May 9, 1594, when *Lucrece* was registered at Stationers' Hall. GOLLANCZ (ed. 1896, pp. xi f.), like many others, is undecided how literally the description of *Venus* as "the first heire of my inuention" is to be taken. He suggests the probability that, as "the first heire" appeared in 1593 and *Lucrece* a year later, "1594 may be the '*terminus a quo*' for the Sonnets." But the

¹ Except, of course, by certain Baconians, who are always on hand to supply low comedy. One of them, ROE (*Baconiana*, July, 1908, pp. 155 f.), says that the license date may be ignored, and that Q was not published till "Bacon's fall in 1621." Does not Bacon say in 123 "Thy [Stationers'] registers and thee [Time] I both defie . . . thy [Stationers'] records . . . doth lye"?

phrase can be explained to suit individual tastes and theories, as when BUTLER (ed. 1899, pp. 90 f.) said that "no one considers his occasional letters whether in prose or verse as heirs to his invention," and hence in the *Venus* dedication Sh. did not have in mind his own earlier verse letters, or sonnets.

Shunning such commonplace testimony, CONRAD (*Jahrbuch*, 1884, XIX, 211) quoted from Nashe's *Pierce Penniless*, 1592 (1910 ed., I, 169), part of these words: "Sometimes (because Loue commonly weares the liuerey of Wit) hee will be an *Inamorato Poeta*, & sonnet a whole quire of paper in praise of Lady *Manibetter*, his yeolow fac'd Mistres, & weare a feather of her rainbeaten fan for a fauor, like a fore-horse." He glossed Lady Manibetter as Sh.'s dark woman, thereby "proving" some of the sonnets to have been well known in 1592.¹ Conrad followed (via Elze) a copy, or a reprint, of the first issue of *Pierce Penniless*. But in corrected issues of the first edition "Lady *Manibetter*" is displaced by "Lady *Swin-snout*." Here, surely, is neglected material for a theory.² Nobody, so far as I know, heeded Conrad except his countryman VON MAUNTZ, who (Sh.'s *Gedichte*, 1894, pp. 147 f., 154, 282-291) indulged in a riot of fancy, explaining Nashe's words as meaning (pp. 288 f.) "that the woman concerned was neither beautiful nor young, and that her lover boasted publicly of her favor. Th. Nash's censure is not aimed at the immorality of this affair, but only at the unworthiness" of the dark woman. The Conrad-von Mauntz interpretation is amazing, even to one inoculated against "Sh. scholarship."

External evidence, then, has not settled the dates. The so-called internal evidence has, unfortunately, likewise proved to be ambiguous, contradictory, or dubious, even when it has led to categoric and confident judgments. A majority of writers on this subject have had some preconceived biographical theory in mind. A case, often a superficially plausible case, can be made for nearly any date to fit nearly any theory, and as a result innumerable books and articles have demonstrated to be "highly probable" or "unquestionable" dates ranging from the early '80's to 1609. Adherents of Southampton and Pembroke are past masters at unearthing internal evidence to prop their respective theories. A few facts about the two earls should be kept in mind.

HENRY WRIOTHESLEY, born October 6, 1573, became on the death of his father, October 4, 1581, third Earl of Southampton and a royal ward. During the early '90's Lord Burghley as guardian (STOPES, *Life of . . . Southampton*, 1922, pp. 34-48, 86) made every effort to arrange a marriage between his granddaughter, Lady Elizabeth Vere, and Southampton, but the latter was so bitterly opposed that late in 1594 he secured a release by paying a forfeit of £5000. In 1595 he began his intrigue with Elizabeth, daughter of John Vernon, of Hodnet, maid of honor to the queen, and cousin of the second Earl of Essex. Southampton may have accompanied Essex on the naval expedition to

¹ ELZE (*William Sh.* [1876], 1888, p. 431), commenting on the typical exaggeration in love sonnets, had quoted the passage from Nashe, without, however, calling it an allusion to Sh.

² As, for example, that the dark woman was the mother of the "hog-faced gentlewoman called Mistress Tannakin Skinker" who agitated London's yellow journalists towards the end of 1639. See my *Pepysian Garland*, 1922, pp. 449 f.

Cadiz in 1596 (Stopes [pp. 96 f.] finds no proof of it¹), as he certainly did to the Azores in 1597. Back in London during November, 1597, he resumed his affair with Vernon; but (Stopes, p. 112) "the Queen frowned upon matrimony, and they took a forbidden path." In February, 1598, Southampton went to France with the English ambassador. Late in August he hurried back to marry Vernon, who was pregnant, and then returned to Paris. Infuriated by news of the marriage, the queen on September 3 (Stopes, p. 123) sent peremptory commands for Southampton "to repair hither to London." Vernon's daughter was born early in November, and for a short time Southampton was committed to the Fleet. In 1599 he went with Essex on the Irish campaign. Later involved in the abortive Essex rebellion, he was tried and condemned to death in 1601. The sentence was changed to imprisonment, but the new king James I promptly released him in 1603. He lived until November 10, 1624.

WILLIAM HERBERT, born April 8, 1580, was sixteen years younger than Sh. Tutored at Wilton by Hugh Sandford and Samuel Daniel, he matriculated at New College, Oxford, in March, 1593, but withdrew two years later. In 1595 a marriage proposed for him with the daughter of Sir George Carey was broken off because of his violent objections. Similar, unsuccessful plans were made in 1597 for him and Lady Bridget Vere. Herbert was at court in 1595 and then fairly regularly after 1598. As a result of their liaison, Mary Fitton, maid of honor, bore him a son in March, 1601. Herbert, who had succeeded to the earldom in January, refused to marry her, and was imprisoned for a short time by the queen. In November, 1604, he married Lady Mary Talbot. He died in 1630.

WYNDHAM (ed. 1898, p. 247) seems to me correct in saying, "It is impossible to *prove* the identity of the youth, and, therefore, illegitimate to found an argument for this or that date on any assumed identification." But almost no one heeds him. Usually Southamptonites argue for an earlier date than the Pembrokeists. The latter can scarcely admit that any one of the sonnets was composed before 1595, while the former are at liberty to date them five or six years earlier if they choose. Many Southamptonites insist that all were finished by the end of 1592 or 1593, but others argue for 1594, 1595, 1596, 1597, 1598, 1603, or even 1608 or 1609. The same liberty in setting a terminal date is open to Pembroke's men. But the theorizers seldom notice that if only one man, Southampton, Pembroke, or another, is addressed in the sonnets a considerable period of time must have elapsed during their composition; for while Sh.'s "loues faire brow" has no lines in 19.10 f., or even in 126, in 70.9 he has "past by the ambush of young daies," while in 77.5 (compare also 100.9-12) he is middle-aged or, at any rate, has "wrinckles" truly reflected by his mirror like "mouthed graues."

The sonnets abound in what have now and then been called allusions or references to persons, events, specific years or seasons. These are often discussed in the notes, but a few illustrations of how they are applied to one biographical theory or another may be given here. Thus BUTLER (*Athenaeum*, July 30, 1898, p. 161), who scorned Southampton and Pembroke to favor a supposititious Hughes, established 1585-1588 by the following reasoning: (1) 2, in which Sh. writes of a man of forty "as though he had one foot in the grave,"

¹ See p. 187 n., below.

could not have been written by a poet "much over twenty"; (2) 104 tells that he has been writing verse to his friend for three years; (3) 107 refers to the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588. Having thus fixed limits for all the sonnets, BUTLER (ed. 1899, pp. 113 *et passim*) without difficulty assigned specific dates to groups or even to individual sonnets, thus:

- 1-77: April, 1585-December 31, 1585
- 78-96: January 1, 1586-early summer, 1586
- 97: Autumn, 1586
- 98, 99: Summer, 1587
- 100-106: March, 1588-April, 1588
- 107: About August 8, 1588
- 108-125: Between August 10 and December 1, 1588
- 127, 128, 130-144, 151, 152: September, 1585
- 147-150: September 1-December 1, 1588

He could not date 126, 129, 145, 146, 153, 154. Though his time scheme must have seemed fairly reasonable to GODWIN (ed. 1900, pp. 26 f.)—who, however, for the large majority of sonnets preferred 1582-1592—and though DOUGLAS (*True History*, 1933, p. 15) accepted it with scarcely a change, many Shakespeareans have completely reversed Butler's arguments, some of them affirming that Sh. so often calls himself old (22, 62, 63, 73) as to lend countenance to a much later date, like 1598; others (as LEE, *Life*, 1898, pp. 85 f.), that all such references to age are meaningless because conventional. Butler, however, remained sure of the validity of his reasoning. It was supported, he thought (p. 90), by the poet's mention in 16.10 of his "pupill pen."

The rival poet, too, bulks large in the discussion. If he is Marlowe, who died in 1593, an early date is required; but if Chapman, the case may be altered. Ordinarily, however, the numerous alleged rivals can be fitted into whatever system of dating writers have already evolved for other reasons. The dark woman is too vague a figure to be of any real help. Those who consider her identical with the heroine of *Willobie His Avis*, like FLEAY and ACHESON, put the sonnets sometimes before, sometimes after, 1594. Mary Fitton's followers, like TYLER and CREIGHTON, argued for 1598-1601. But Avis, Fitton, and the other dark women are considerably more speculative than the dates themselves.

Allusions to other persons and to events of one sort or another have been detected—and rejected—in various sonnets (see, for example, the notes to 14, 23, 30, 66, 78, 80, 90, 98, 124, 125). Those usually considered most important for dating are 104 and 107, but commentators (as the notes will show) differ widely in their explanations of what these sonnets mean, of when they were written.¹ For example, DONNELLY (*Sonnets of Sh.*, 1859, pp. 6 f.) decided from the references to age in 2, 22, 62, 63 that all the sonnets were written between 1604, when Sh. was forty, and 1609, when *Q* was published. 104 is continuous with 62 and 63; "consequently, three years prior to 1604, that is to say in 1600 or 1601, Shakspeare and his young friend had met for the first time."

¹ See KARPFF on the meaning of 104, p. 159, below.

Very different was the interpretation of MINTO (*Characteristics*, 1874, pp. 287 f.), who thought 107 was composed after the queen's death in March, 1603. In 104, Sh. says, three years have passed since he met his young friend. "If there is not a gap of several years between the 104th and 107th—and in the absence of evidence to the contrary the presumption is that there is not—this would seem to show that Shakespeare made the acquaintance of his friend not long before the beginning of the century," the friend in this case being Herbert, who came to London in 1598 (*sic*). FLEAY, however (*Macmillan's*, 1875, XXXI, 437), regarded 1-125 as a single poem written in 1596—a date established by 104, which was composed three years after the dedication of *Venus* to Southampton, the friend. Like many other constant writers on Sh., FLEAY changed his mind. In 1876 (*Sh. Manual*, p. 22) he dated the sonnets 1596, in 1886 (*Chronicle History*, p. 25) "between 1594 and 1598"; but by 1891 (*Biographical Chronicle*, II, 221, 223) he had decided that 1-126 were composed between 1595 and 1598, 127-154 "about 1595."

TYLER (ed. 1890, pp. 22-27) saw references in 107 and 124 to the Essex rebellion of 1601. "In all probability" 100-126 are "a single poem, or a connected series written about the same time," perhaps in "the early summer or spring" of 1601. Accordingly, 104, dating from 1601, proves that Sh. had first met Pembroke three years before. On various other occasions Tyler argued for this dating 1598-1601. GOLLANCZ (ed. 1896, p. xiii) opposed it: "We may perhaps assume that the earliest Sonnets belong to about 1595. If Sonnet CIV. were taken strictly, the period covered would be (*circa*) 1595- (*circa*) 1598. The date, however, cannot be definitely fixed until we are in possession of some of the facts underlying the poems." He was a Southamptonite. The Pembrokist BOAS (*Sh. and His Predecessors*, 1896, p. 118) tells us that Sh.'s intimacy with the friend began "about 1597 or the spring of 1598." The three years of 104 "give 1601 as the date which brings the incidents referred to in the poems to a close." There is something dryly humorous in reasoning which thus proceeds from the unknown to the unknown with glib assurance. It has continued without interruption up to the present day. In 104, VON KRALIK (*Kultur*, 1907, VIII, 387) asserts, Sh. says that he has now been united with his friend for three years, and so the whole collection is exactly dated. 1-26 are shown, by parallels, to have been written at the same time as *Venus*, that is in 1593; whereas 27-55 correspond to *Lucrece*, 1594. Most of the remaining sonnets belong to the years 1595-1596. Compare HADOW's remark (ed. 1907, pp. xi n., ix) that in 104 "the whole duration of the story is said . . . to be three years, which would fit the hypothesis 1597-9," though perhaps "a few were written earlier as isolated numbers," and "some" after 1600. But, H. D. GRAY (*P. M. L. A.*, 1915, XXX, 641 f.) objects, 104 cannot be later than 1599, which is the date of most of 100-125; some, like 107 and 152, "may belong to the *Hamlet* period"; 153 and 154 are "earlier sonnets," and others "may well" antedate 1596. KELLER (*Sh.'s Werke*, 1916, XV, 516) sees in 104 the only definitely dated sonnet. Like FLEAY (1875) he thinks the three years began with the dedication of *Venus* in April, 1593. 107 probably (p. 117) belongs to 1594, and the whole sequence to 1593-1596.

By 1916 the discussion had got exactly nowhere. Whether it progressed satisfactorily in the next quarter century is a matter of personal opinion. In recent years the Southamptonite FORT devoted himself to the dating. But in

his *Two Dated Sonnets*, 1924, he adds little that is new. From 104, the first dated sonnet, which he assigns (p. 29) to March or April, 1596, "we must surely" (pp. 21 f.) put the meeting of Sh. and his friend in April, 1593, when *Venus* was registered for publication; surely, because in the dedication Sh. tells that he left a manuscript of *Venus* for the earl's perusal, and probably the day on which he did so was the day of their first meeting. Sh. is alleged to have given this information in the phrase, "I leaue it to your Honourable suruey." Starting off with these assumptions (he appears to consider them facts) and a belief that the Q order is correct, Fort provides dates for most of the series 1-126 (pp. 24-36): 1-26, May, 1593-May, 1594; 27-75, May, 1594-April, 1595; 76-99, spring and summer, 1595; 100-104, spring, 1596; 107 (the second "dated" sonnet), November, 1598; 108-112, spring, 1599; 113-116, April-September, 1599; 117-122, autumn, 1599; 123-125, October, 1600-February 8, 1601; 126, January or February, 1601. To explain the extraordinary gap of two years and a half between 104 and 107 Fort assumes (pp. 30-33) that Sh. wrote for Southampton the *L. C.* "in the place of sonnets." His speculations and conclusions seem to me, as to G. C. M. SMITH (*M. L. R.*, 1925, XX, 232), "anything but convincing." Yet POLLARD (*Library*, March, 1925, pp. 375 f.) commended his date for 104 as "sound." J. D. WILSON (*R. E. S.*, 1925, I, 354-356) also calls the dating of 107 "probably sound," but goes on to notice that Fort's theories are dependent on the identification of the friend as Southampton. To Wilson 104 looks like a birthday letter, which could not have been sent to Southampton, who was born in October. It could fit Pembroke, who was born on April 9, and if Sh. first met him in 1598, then 104 would agree with his coming of age in 1601. Wilson observes further that Fort's scheme calls for two and a half sonnet-less years between 104 and 107, the latter supposedly being written when Southampton was released from the Fleet prison in November, 1598; whereas by an equally good hypothesis if 104 was written in April, 1601, then 107 would apply to Pembroke's release from prison in 1601, thus bringing the two dated sonnets "within a week or two of each other."

FORT gave his views about 127-152 in 1927 (*R. E. S.*, III, 408): they were composed soon after 26, for Southampton "first began to court the Dark Lady" in May or June, 1594. He expanded his views on 1-126 in December, 1928 (*Library*, pp. 305-325). But three months later (the same, March, 1929, pp. 381-384) he had changed his mind. He now agreed with HARRISON (*T. L. S.*, November 29, 1928, p. 938) that 107 belonged to October, 1596; and he argued that the latest in 1-126 must have been written before Southampton's departure for France in February, 1598, since no sonnet in the series refers to his marriage, for which he secretly returned to England in August of that year. Further details were added in FORT's expanded *Time Scheme*, 1929. For those who enjoy such exercises of ingenuity I reproduce his final dating:¹

1-26: April, 1593-May, 1594 (p. 29)

27, 28: May, 1594 (p. 41)

¹ Misprints (as on p. 45) and vague statements obscure parts of it. 129, 146, 153, 154 apparently are not definitely dated: it is not clear whether they are to be included in "the Dark Lady sonnets" of June-July or August, 1594 (see pp. 23, 44 f., 91, 143).

- 29-34, 127, 128, 130-134: June, 1594 (pp. 41, 45)
 35-42, 135-145, 147-152: July or August, 1594 (pp. 44 f.)
 43-106: September, 1594-April, 1596 (p. 50)
 107-126: October, 1596-March, April, 1597 (p. 81)

Probably Fort was grateful when a former doubter, J. D. WILSON (*Essential Sh.*, 1932, pp. 60 f.), accepted his later theories, and said, "The bulk of the *Sonnets* . . . must have been written between April 1593 and September [*sic*] 1596." Then CHAMBERS (*William Sh.*, 1930, I, 564 f.) decided that the three years of 104 were probably 1593-1596; "the bulk of the sonnets belong to this period," and "others were added more sparsely up to 1599 or so,"¹ a "more plausible date" for 107 being 1599-1600. MACKAIL (*Approach to Sh.*, 1930, p. 117), however, threatened to spoil the machinery; 104 "can be read to mean," he declared, that Sh. met his friend nine, not three, years before. If this be true, much wasted water has flowed under the bridge of scholarship and criticism. But, unsuspecting of any such gloss, GILLET (*Shakespeare*, 1931, p. 129) thinks, or seems to think, that all the sonnets were written during 1598-1602.

The debate over the "dated sonnets" will probably never end, in spite of its futility. MATTINGLY (*P. M. L. A.*, 1933, XLVIII, 705-721) argued in favor of the date 1603 for 107, and attempted to reassure those who believe that "no considerable period of time elapsed between" 104 and 107 by suggesting a late dating for the whole series 100-126. Such reassurance was not needed by RENDALL (*T. L. S.*, March 15, 1934, p. 194), an Oxfordian, who assigned 104 to 1596 and 107 to 1603, unembarrassed by "an interval of seven years" between them. These views were developed in RENDALL's *Personal Clues*, 1934 (pp. 157-185). BRANDL (*Shakespeare*, 1922, 1937, p. 151) decided in advance that the earliest sonnets were written in or about 1593, and from 104 arrived at his terminal date 1596. From the same material YOUNG (*Sonnets of Sh.*, 1937, pp. 111, 113, 106, 115) concluded that while none is earlier than the spring of 1596, "the last of them was written in the summer or fall of 1603," the date referred to in 107 and 126. I have commented elsewhere (pp. 193 f., below) on the free and easy way in which the Southamptonites refute one another's arguments. FRIPP (*Shakespeare*, 1938, I, 267), in opposition to Young and others, places 1-26 "in the summer or autumn of 1590" before Southampton fled to the continent; hence 104 (p. 331) refers to the three years 1590-1592 during which 27-126 were composed. To him (p. 259) it is "unthinkable" that any of the sonnets is later than 1594, and "in the highest degree probable" that all were written by the end of 1593.

Obviously 104 and 107 are a weak prop to support so strong a burden as the dating. The "dated sonnets," which students of equal eminence assign to whatever year suits their particular views, have, in spite of "probably," "doubtless," and "inconceivable," failed in their supposed purpose. A way out was provided by WOLFF (*E. S.*, 1916, XLIX, 179 f.): in the three years of 104, as elsewhere, Sh. was dealing in a Petrarchan mannerism. Three years is an extremely short period of affection to be stressed in the sixteenth century,

¹ But at I, 73, he had said: "Their composition covers a period of three years and more, probably from 1595 to 1599 or 1600."

when Alamanni wrote of having loved for nine, Bernardo Tasso for ten, Sannazaro for eleven, Bembo for fifteen, and others for thirty years. All such periods of "loving" are arbitrary and conventional.

What has been called a third dated sonnet, 35, was discussed at length by R. H. DARBY in 1939 (*Jahrbuch*, LXXV, 135-138). He fixes attention on line 3, "Cloudes and eclipses staine both Moone and Sunne." To him "the present tense suggests an immediate actuality," but others will note that the generalizing present runs throughout the opening lines. Observing further that *eclipse* is used two other times in the sonnets (60.7, 107.5), but that only here are "both the moon and the sun" mentioned, he looked for "one time during the 1590's when there occurred synchronus [*sic*] lunar and solar eclipses," and he discovered that in the decade 1590-1600 there were fifteen eclipses of the moon but "only four of the sun that might have been visible to any extent [anywhere] in England." He decided that Sh. had in mind "the solar eclipse of May 20, 1594, [which] was preceded by a partial eclipse of the moon on May 8," because the "Roses," "canker," and "sweetest bud" "suggest the later spring"; and because the "Cloudes" of 35 plus similar clouds and rain in 28.10, 33.5, 12, 34.3-6, make up "a concentration of 'wet' signs [which] would appear to indicate an unusually rainy season. This perfectly fits the spring of 1594." All this reasoning appears to me to rest upon a far too literal interpretation of 35, which actually is generalizing throughout: all men have faults, it says, just as all roses have thorns, all fountains mud, all the sweetest buds canker-worms—just as the sun and moon are periodically made dim by clouds and eclipses. Darby, however, is confident that 33-35 belong to 1594, not to the total eclipse (in "Ireland, Northern England and Scotland") of March 7, 1598. The earlier date fits Meres's reference of 1598, "for it must have required a little time for Shakespeare's 'sugred sonnets' to get around among his 'priuate friends' by the slow process of manuscript circulation," and because 1598 "would preclude the passing of three winters' time mentioned in no. 104, if no. 138 and no. 144 . . . [published in 1599] are in their approximately correct order"—this last a very large *if* indeed. Darby's effort at pinning down "some" of the sonnets to the spring of 1594 is in my opinion unsuccessful,¹ although H. D. GRAY (*Stanford Studies*, 1941, p. 144) was "disconcerted recently" to find himself convinced by it.

Naturally efforts have been made to date the sonnets on the basis of borrowings from or parallels to other writers, but this evidence, in turn, is oracular. The borrowings, actual or hypothetical, from Sidney, Marlowe, Spenser, Daniel, Drayton, Constable, Barnes, and the rest prove little or nothing. In the case of Drayton (see pp. 121-123, below) it has been argued that his *Ideas Mirrour*, 1594, borrows from Sh., a matter of some importance if it were definitely established. Alleged borrowings from Marston (1598) in 32 and Meres

¹ FLEAY (*Biographical Chronicle*, 1891, II, 217), had, not much more fancifully, explained 35.3 as meaning that the moon (Cynthia-Elizabeth) and the sun (Southampton) were eclipsed, this being "conclusive of a date when Shakespeare was temporarily out of favour with both Court and Patron," about June, 1597.

(1598) in 55 are now commonly denied. Phrases from 94 and 142 were long ago noticed in the old play (licensed for publication on December 1, 1595 [Arber, *Transcript*, 1876, III, 55]) of *The Reign of Edward III*, but perhaps the majority of commentators think that 94 and 142 antedated its composition.

Baffled by the inconclusive testimony thus evoked, critics have come to rely more and more on an examination of parallels in phraseology, thought, and style between the sonnets and Sh.'s other work. But here, too, the result has often been for men and women of presumably equal intelligence to attain diametrically opposed results.

Thus VON FRIESEN (*Sh.-Studien*, 1874, I, 335-338, 346-348) assures us that very few of the sonnets were written after 1594-1595. Their correspondences with *Love's Labor's Lost* indicate an early date, and so do those with *Venus*. No thoughts like those in the sonnets occur in any of the plays later than *Romeo and Juliet*, which he dates 1595. In addition, confusion of moods and emotions in the sonnets makes von Friesen believe that they were written by a poet in the most decisive period of his development—from 1590-1591 to 1594-1595.

MASSEY (ed. 1866, pp. 36-39) first printed a list of apparent borrowings by Sh. from Sidney's *Arcadia*, 1590. Later (ed. 1888, p. 74) he professed to show that 1-13 were written in imitation of the *Arcadia* but before Sh. had read *Astrophel and Stella*, 1591, levyings on which begin with 14.¹ Massey's material is perhaps more valuable than his deductions, but the latter were enthusiastically endorsed by KRAUSS (*Jahrbuch*, 1876, XI, 237-244), who culled numerous parallels to the sonnets from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Romeo and Juliet*.

Far more detailed and painstaking was the study of CONRAD (*Jahrbuch*, 1884, XIX, 176-264), though it is partly vitiated by his unauthorized, totally subjective, and confused rearrangement of the sonnets into chronological groups,² based on alleged similarity of subject-matter and ranging from 1589 to 1600-1601, and by the arbitrary dates he attributed to various plays. By no means all Conrad's parallels—which are often only a single word or a brief phrase—are given in full; but, even so, the mere list of references has considerable value, in spite of the shaky conclusions to which they drew him. As late as 1914 (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, CLVI, 445) he wrote proudly of his new method of research—the use of “more than three hundred parallels of thought and structure”—which had proved “that all the love sonnets and most of the friendship sonnets use the poetic material of the youthful plays and narrative poems (1588-1593) to which they incline in groups, according to the number of

¹ With this notion compare FORT's (*Library*, December, 1928, pp. 310 f.): “It is hardly possible . . . that Shakespeare composed any sonnets in the year 1591,” since the sonnet vogue began only in that year with the publication of *Astrophel and Stella*. 1592 “is less likely” than 1593 as the date of Sh.'s earliest sonnets, for in 1592 “only Daniel and Constable, both of whom had evidently seen Sidney's poems in manuscript,” published sonnet sequences, “while in 1593 . . . four of Shakespeare's contemporaries published” them.

² Which he changed somewhat in the *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, 1909, I, 242 f.

repetitions; while a hundred other parallels refer the remainder to the middle of the nineties and to the end of the century."

Similar materials compiled by HORACE DAVIS I know only through ALDEN's account (ed. 1916, pp. 447 f.). The following table gives the approximate number (they are extremely difficult to count) of parallels found by Conrad and Davis,¹ the dates assigned to the plays being those of CHAMBERS (*William Sh.*, 1930, I, 270 f.).

<i>Sonnets Parallels Noted by</i>	<i>CONRAD and DAVIS</i>	
2 <i>Henry VI</i> (1590-1591)	20	14 (15)
3 <i>Henry VI</i> (1590-1591)	16	17 (17)
1 <i>Henry VI</i> (1591-1592)	11	12 (13)
<i>Richard III</i> (1592-1593)	23	24 (27)
<i>Comedy of Errors</i> (1592-1593)	11	22 (22)
<i>Venus</i> (1593)	34	64 (71)
<i>Titus Andronicus</i> (1593-1594)	9	18 (18)
<i>Taming of the Shrew</i> (1593-1594)	8	7 (11)
<i>Lucrece</i> (1594)	38	60 (65)
<i>Two Gentlemen</i> (1594-1595)	31	35 (41)
<i>Love's Labor's Lost</i> (1594-1595)	36	49 (64)
<i>Romeo and Juliet</i> (1594-1595)	47	48 (65)
<i>Richard II</i> (1595-1596)	22	26 (29)
<i>Midsummer Night's Dream</i> (1595-1596)	20	45 (52)
<i>King John</i> (1596-1597)	18	22 (30)
<i>Merchant of Venice</i> (1596-1597)	7	23 (31)
1 <i>Henry IV</i> (1597-1598)	8	10 (14)
2 <i>Henry IV</i> (1597-1598)	14	13 (21)
<i>Much Ado</i> (1598-1599)	9	7 (16)
<i>Henry V</i> (1598-1599)	3	7 (16)
<i>Julius Caesar</i> (1599-1600)	1	3 (9)
<i>As You Like It</i> (1599-1600)	22	13 (30)
<i>Twelfth Night</i> (1599-1600)	14	15 (27)
<i>Hamlet</i> (1600-1601)	17	15 (35)
<i>Merry Wives</i> (1600-1601)	6	7 (12)
<i>Troilus</i> (1601-1602)	25	16 (31)
<i>All's Well</i> (1602-1603)	12	10 (23)
<i>Measure for Measure</i> (1604-1605)	14	8 (18)
<i>Othello</i> (1604-1605)	6	12 (22)
<i>King Lear</i> (1605-1606)	2	11 (24)
<i>Macbeth</i> (1605-1606)	3	5 (23)
<i>Antony and Cleopatra</i> (1606-1607)	15	7 (30)
<i>Coriolanus</i> (1607-1608)	4	4 (9)

¹ The table, some may think, has no real value in the absence of the parallels themselves, but to reproduce the latter would obviously be impossible here. The figures in parentheses, kindly supplied by my friend, O. M. WILLARD, of Stanford University, represent the total number of parallels as they now stand in Davis's manuscript. Apparently Davis added a considerable number after it had been consulted for Alden's edition.

<i>Sonnets Parallels Noted by</i>	<i>CONRAD and DAVIS</i>	
<i>Timon</i> (1607-1608)	5	4 (10)
<i>Pericles</i> (1608-1609)	7	0 (6)
<i>Lover's Complaint</i> (printed 1609)	12	- (5)
<i>Cymbeline</i> (1609-1610)	13	7 (21)
<i>Winter's Tale</i> (1610-1611)	7	6 (24)
<i>Tempest</i> (1611-1612)	4	2 (20)
<i>Henry VIII</i> (1612-1613)	7	4 (5)

MARGERY BAILEY (in Alden, ed. 1916, p. 448) regards "the general tendency to coincidence in these two lists as fairly significant," although the two plays heading both in number of parallels, *Love's Labor's Lost* and *Romeo and Juliet*, "are thought to have been revised about 1597, so that they can be used in support of the claims of both the first and the second period." FORT (*Time Scheme*, 1929, pp. 18-21) examines the Conrad-Davis figures at length, and decides that they support his early dates 1593-1597 for the sonnets.

SARRAZIN (*Jahrbuch*, 1895, XXXI, 219-230), unlike Conrad, believed the dark-woman sonnets, 127-154, the first to be written—around 1592; and he reinforced the belief by compiling parallels between them, *Venus*, and its immediate successor *Richard III*. A similar compilation indicated that 1-20 were composed about the same time, the autumn of 1593, as *Love's Labor's Lost*, which they closely resemble. A year later (the same, 1896, XXXII, 152) he was saying that 127-154, as well as the friendship sonnets, because of numerous parallels with *Venus* and *Lucrece* "most probably belong to the years 1592-1594." Again (*William Sh.'s Lehrjahre*, 1897, p. 151) he declared that the youthful sonnet period, including "the songs addressed to the 'dark woman,' which are probably the earliest (127-154 {152?})), as well as the first sonnets of friendship," is bounded by the years 1592-1594. Sh.'s affair with the dark woman—reflected in *Venus*, *Love's Labor's Lost* (1593), *The Two Gentlemen* (1592-1594), and *Romeo and Juliet* (1593-1594)—happened about 1592. Next SARRAZIN (*Jahrbuch*, 1897, XXXIII, 121-165; 1898, XXXIV, 119-169) elaborately examined and tabulated what he called the dislegomena and trislegomena (words used only twice or three times) in Sh.'s complete works. By establishing the frequency of "Wortechos," he thought it possible to determine more exactly than before the chronological order of the plays, his idea being that the words rare in Sh. occur in plays written in the same immediate period. But, thinking the sonnets to belong to several years, he distrusted the application of his method to them. Nevertheless (XXXIV, 169) parallel words indicate that they were composed "rather in the time of *Venus* and *Adonis*, *Richard III*, *Love's Labor's Lost*, and *Lucrece* than in any other period." In still later pronouncements SARRAZIN dated the sequence 1592-1597 (*Aus Sh.'s Meisterwerkstatt*, 1906, pp. 99, 104 f.) and 1593-1596 (*Internationale Monatsschrift*, 1914, VIII, 1074 f.), apparently without losing faith in the efficacy of his word echoes.

LEE (*Life*, 1898, pp. 85-87) contended that "the greater number [of the sonnets] were in all likelihood composed" between the spring of 1593 and the autumn of 1594, the rest "occasionally and at irregular intervals" from 1594 to 1603. "Such external evidence as is accessible," he wrote later (ed. 1905,

p. 18), "assigns the majority of them to . . . a period antecedent to 1598. Internal evidence is on this point very strongly corroborative of the external testimony. The language and imagery of the sonnets closely connects them with the work which is positively known to have occupied Shakespeare before 1595 or 1596. . . . Only a few of the parallels in the later work are so close in phrase or sentiment as those in the earlier work." But the use of *prophetick soule* and *Quietus*, which occur elsewhere only in *Hamlet*, indicates that 107 and 126 are "of comparatively late date."

McCLUMPHA (*M. L. N.*, 1900, XV, 168-174, 1901, XVI, 164-168; *Jahrbuch*, 1904, XL, 187-203) bolstered Lee's assertions of early dating by compiling examples of parallel passages in the sonnets with *Love's Labor's Lost*, with *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and with *Romeo and Juliet*. BEECHING (ed. 1904, pp. xxiv-xxvii), however, damaged it by "the argument from repeated expressions," or "the perverse facility with which a phrase once used presents itself again," a literary habit to which Sh. "seems to have been not a little liable. . . . It is not uncommon for him to use a word or a phrase twice in a single play, and never afterwards. There is a strong probability, therefore, if a remarkable phrase or figure of speech occurs both in a sonnet and in a play, that the play and the sonnet belong to the same period." Actually what he does is to carry on Sarrazin's method, and he gives numerous striking examples from 1 *Henry IV*, 2 *Henry IV*, *Much Ado*, *Twelfth Night*, *Hamlet*, and *Othello*. "Every indication of both internal and external evidence," in his judgment, suggests that the sonnets were written later than 1594.

WIETFIELD in a discussion of *Bildersprache in Sh.'s Sonetten*, 1916, attained results unlike Beeching's. A tabulation of parallels of imagery in the sonnets and the remainder of Sh.'s work reveals (pp. 125-127) that the greatest gross correspondences are with *Lucrece* (eighty-three parallels) and *Venus* (fifty-four parallels), as might be expected, because the subject-matter of the sonnets and the two long poems is similar. The plays most closely echoing the sonnets are *Love's Labor's Lost*, *King John*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Henry IV*, *Richard III*, and *Richard II*. If only images presumably original with Sh. be considered, a net tabulation brings the same results, except that *Henry IV* and *Richard III* drop out. Even so, Wietfeld does not consider it his problem "to base a chronology of the sonnets on these more or less close parallels," for "chance often plays a large part in similarities of this kind. . . . A sharp distinction between strong and weak parallels is not possible in every individual case." This last sentence only too truly describes a serious weakness in the whole method—a method twice rejected by WILLIAM ARCHER (*Fortnightly*, 1897, LXVIII, 821, 825) in the words "similar situations beget similar expressions." Incidentally, Archer (p. 822) sees not "a single valid indication (much less a proof) that any of the sonnets were written earlier than 1597."

ARTHUR BEATTY (*Wisconsin Sh. Studies*, 1916, pp. 201-214) tackled the problem from another direction. He found in Sh.'s plays thirty-six (*sic*) sonnet-like passages (exclusive of actual sonnets) in blank verse and prose, eleven of which he dates 1589-1596, six 1596-1599, fifteen 1602-1607. These led him to the inference (p. 213) that "the sonnet habit was a constant in Shakespeare's mind at least from 1591 to 1609," and that (p. 212) the lyrics of Q "were written during a considerable number of years."

O. F. EMERSON'S method (*S. P.*, 1923, XX, 126-136) was to analyze the feminine rimes and the line structure. His figures made him believe that 127-154 were composed before 1-126: the former group has 5.5% of feminine rimes, the latter 8.7%.¹ Perhaps 127-154 were "an experiment on the basis of the more common reference to a woman, the more original idea of a masculine series coming later," a supposition strengthened by the fact that the dark-woman sonnets have 17.4% of run-on lines to 19.4% for 1-126. On the evidence of feminine rimes alone—16% in *Venus*, about 11% in *Lucrece*, and 8% in the sonnets—Emerson inferred that "while the *Sonnets* may have been somewhat earlier than the poems, they can not have been much later." But the evidence of run-on lines, 8.8% in *Venus*, 13.8% in *Lucrece*, 19.2% in the sonnets, convinced him that the last "were written about the time of *Lucrece*, or soon after." His final dating, 1592-1595, for the whole sequence thus depends on figures and percentages which, of course, I have made no effort to verify.

BECKWITH (*J. E. G. P.*, 1926, XXV, 227-242) objected to the Conrad-Sarrazin principle of "grouping the sonnets by subject and dating those in a group together." In her judgment greater significance could be attached to Sh.'s habit of repeating words and phrases very soon after he had first used them and of subsequently dropping them from his vocabulary. Ignoring, then, subject-matter and style (and ignoring also Beeching, who had discussed this very matter), she arranged the sonnets "which have passages paralleled in the plays according to the dramatic chronology given by Neilson and Thorndike in *Facts about Shakespeare*," particularly emphasizing odd words and phrases found only in one play and one sonnet. After her arrangement was completed, Beckwith was gratified to see that "the development of style checks with the order determined by parallel passages." Although her study "leaves such regret[t]ably large gaps where no such parallelism occurs, it is . . . the soundest method open to us by which we can arrive at any sort of chronology." Fifty-three (*sic*) sonnets can thus "be placed in their periods with fair certainty":

1591: 7, 14, 21, 48, 52, 57, 58, 127, 131, 132, 137, 147
 1593: 1, 2, 4-6, 8-11, 15-17 [she gives 16 twice], 22, 31, 41, 49, 112
 1594: 13, 25, 26
 1595: 27, 28, 87, 88, 95, 97, 150
 1598: 71
 1599: 81
 1601: 100, 101, 110
 1602: 107, 12
 1603: 3

¹ Compare T. R. PRICE (*Studies in Honor of . . . Gildersleeve*, 1902, p. 372): "If all the sonnets be taken together, the feminine rhymes make only eight per cent and the masculine rhymes make 92 per cent. But the distribution of the feminine rhymes is plainly not accidental nor according to any law of general average. From great masses of the sonnets [like 95-101, 103-110] . . . the feminine rhyme is altogether absent. . . . The use of feminine rhymes is at its lowest in . . . 71-80 and 101-110, and at its highest in . . . 11-20, 81-90 and 111-120."

1604: 30, 121, 125

1606: 113

1607: 63

On this "sturdy framework" she expressed the hope, apparently unfulfilled, of hanging a "complete but more tentative chronology."

While Beckwith arrived at the dates 1591-1607, HELENA F. MILLER (*P. Q.*, 1930, IX, 373) applied a grammatical test with entirely different results. "In his early works," she observes, Sh. "uses *hath* and *doth*, with *doth* occurring more often than *hath* in *Venus*, *Lucrece* and the Sonnets, where pleonastic *do* has freer play." In the sonnets *hath* occurs forty-five times, *doth* eighty-five, *has* and *does* not once.¹ Miller's conclusion is, "The absence of *has* and *does* confirms the theory that the Sonnets, though written at different times, are all early."

The parallels, the repeated words, the stylistic mannerisms amassed by Conrad, Sarrazin, and the rest are often interpreted more or less impressionistically. The discussions earlier than 1911 were, presumably, familiar to MACKAIL (*Lectures*, 1911, pp. 185-187, 191); yet he knew "no reason to think that 1603 or 1604 is not the posterior limit" for the writing of the sonnets. They "were in the main composed at intervals over a space of some five years, 1598-1603," as is indicated by the style. "The power of thought, the charged fulness of language, the mastery of compressed and allusive style, are qualities not of the Shakespeare of *Venus and Adonis* or *Lucrece*, not of the Shakespeare of the *Midsummer Night's Dream*, not even of the Shakespeare of *Love's Labour's Lost* after its revision in 1597," but are of the Sh. of the great comedies, the great tragedies. Once again (*Approach to Sh.*, 1930, p. 111) he asserts that 1609 is "five or six years later than the latest date" of any of the sonnets, and is "from twenty to twenty-five years after the original composition of the greater part of them." In much the same way NEILSON and THORNDIKE (*Facts*, 1913, pp. 87 f.) hear in many of the greatest sonnets "a note of emotion more profound than can be heard before the date of *Hamlet*. . . . The probability is that they were produced at intervals over a period of perhaps a dozen years. . . . While some of them betray signs of youth . . . , others display . . . the full maturity of the man and the artist." MATTINGLY (*P. M. L. A.*, 1933, XLVIII, 708) grants that "most of the affinities between the sonnets taken as a whole and the other works are with productions generally dated between 1592 and 1597." But an analysis shows that a large majority of the parallels in 100-126 are with "plays of the 'middle period'. . . . If stylistic comparison places" at least 1-72 and most of 127-154 "before 1598," it also argues "a much later date for the group around" 107. He is sure that "most critics not burdened with some a priori theory" agree with him.

One distinguished scholar who disagrees is BROOKE (ed. 1936, pp. 10-17). As he sees it, parallels are more common with the poems and plays of Sh.'s first period. His notes cite thirty-seven for *Romeo and Juliet*, thirty-one for *Lucrece*, twenty-four for *Love's Labor's Lost*, twenty-one for *Venus*, fifteen for

¹ In MRS. FURNESS'S *Concordance*, 1874 (based upon the Cambridge edition), the figures seem to be forty-three and eighty-eight respectively.

The Two Gentlemen, thirteen for *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, twelve for *Richard II*. Willingly he admits (p. 16) that 66 and 94 resemble *Hamlet*, 129 *Lear* and *Measure for Measure*, 137, 141, 150 *Antony and Cleopatra*; but the explanation of these resemblances is simply that Sh.'s "development within the sonnet's scanty plot of ground far outspeeded his development as a dramatist." All things considered, a dating of 1592-1596 for the sonnets is, he decides, imperative.

Finally, I must mention my old student and friend F. Y. ST. CLAIR, who has made a searching study, which he hopes some day to publish, of parallels and of the vocabulary of the sonnets. It has convinced him that "by far the greatest number" of 1-154 "were written between 1591 and 1596. *A priori*, we should expect this, and the evidence of the parallel passages (especially the parallels which involve the published poems and plays) is overwhelming."

Readers who have ploughed their weary way through the foregoing summary may perhaps feel that dating the sonnets is a game of chance like blind-man's buff or catch-as-catch-can. When so many talented men and women have been at odds, there appears to be no reason for the present writer's making still another (he could not possibly make a new) declaration about the date.¹ But a number of commentators and critics not represented adequately, if at all, in the preceding pages do await a hearing. They follow alphabetically, rout upon rout, possibly confounding confusion.

ACHESON (*Sh. and the Rival Poet*, 1903, p. 25): "Many of the Sonnets were written previous to 1595, and . . . the whole series antedates 1601." In *Sh.'s Sonnet Story*, 1922 (p. 51), he limits all to 1592-1598.

ADAMS (*Life*, 1923, pp. 163-166): That Sh. "began to write his sequence in 1592-94 seems beyond reasonable doubt." The sonnet vogue was "then at the zenith of its popularity." *Love's Labor's Lost*, 1592, "clearly reveals a lively interest in the sonnet, including as it does seven quatorzains. . . . Moreover, the many striking parallels in thought, imagery, and phraseology between his [Sh.'s] *Sonnets* and his early work, most conspicuous by far in *Love's Labour's Lost* and the poems, and gradually disappearing after we pass the year 1594, make the date of the inception of the cycle virtually certain. . . . By 1597 the vogue was passing; and it is hardly possible to think of . . . the busy actor and playwright, who now had definitely abandoned non-dramatic composition, as setting himself at a later period to a literary type then the object of general ridicule." But, while they were circulating in manuscript, "doubtless . . . he took advantage of the opportunity which the custom allowed, as did other poets, to revise and improve his sonnets from time to time." Evidence of such revision is seen in the two *P. P.* sonnets, 99 is an "unfinished effort to hammer the thought into the requisite fourteen lines," 36 and 96 "awk-

¹ The possibilities seem to be exhausted with HABERL's heroic abnegation (*Entwicklung des optischen . . . Sinnes bei Sh.*, 1913, p. 26): "Out of respect for the Immortal I will refrain from any hypothesis concerning the date of composition of the sonnets. . . . It is possible to come to some conclusion about the date of composition of a large, comprehensive piece of work, but not about little lyrics."

wardly have the same concluding couplet; and the two final sonnets are merely variants of the same theme. Perhaps the poet was especially applying himself to a revision of the cycle in 1597-1598. . . . And, of course he might, if so disposed, add an occasional new sonnet."

ADNÈS (*Sh. et la folie*, 1936, p. 284): Sh. composed the sonnets "without method, in response to inspiration, between his twenty-fifth and his thirtieth year" (1589-1594).

ALDEN (*Shakespeare*, 1922, p. 119): Since definite evidence is lacking, "it is natural to assume that Shakespeare began to write sonnets at the time when everyone else was doing so," that is, around 1591 and 1592, "and continued to write them in diminishing numbers for an indefinite period."

BODENSTEDT (Sh.'s *Sonette*, 1866, pp. 217 f.): The sonnets cannot be given a definite date, but some are certainly mature enough to be placed late in Sh.'s creative life; while others belong in the first period, that of the *P. P.*

BRANDES (*William Sh.*, 1898, I, 313, 317): The sonnets "must date from about 1601." Sh. wrote others before 1598, but "very possibly" we have none of them.

H. J. BRIDGES (*Our Fellow Sh.*, 1916, pp. 276 f.): The majority are "not later than 1594," though 107 belongs to 1603.

CARTWRIGHT (ed. 1859, p. 11): The period of composition began in 1591 and extended "to the spring of 1596 at latest," for in this latter year Southampton went to Spain (see p. 57, above).

COLLIER (ed. 1843, pp. 473 f.): Some were written "in youth," others "in more advanced age," still others "were scattered among his [Sh.'s] friends in 1598, and no doubt he continued to add to them from year to year."

DELIUS (*Jahrbuch*, 1865, I, 30) seems to think that all the sonnets may have been completed as early as 1592.

DOWDEN (*Sh.: A Critical Study*, 1875, p. ix) gives "(?) 1592-1602." In his *Shakspeare*, 1877 (p. 112), all the sonnets are said to lie "somewhere between 1595 and 1605." Again (ed. 1881, pp. 23 f.), no sonnet is "earlier than Daniel's *Delia* (1592)," and "I should not be disposed to place any later than 1605."

FILON (*Revue des deux mondes*, 1901, 5th series, II, 810 f.) approves the date 1590-1605. He feels that, though the early sonnets are like the *Arcadia*, later ones reveal the author of *Hamlet* and *The Tempest*.

FURNIVALL (ed. 1877, p. lxvi): Perhaps a few, say 1-26, had been written by 1598; but 66 "must surely be about the *Hamlet* time" (1602), and others, like 107, belong to Sh.'s "Third Period." The entire series may be dated (p. xvii n.) "?1593-1608."

GENÉE (*Shakespeare*, 1872, p. 83): "One may assume that the cycle, the greater part of which was perhaps first written around 1600, does not fall into a definite period, but rather contains elements derived from the moods of various times and situations in life."

GERVINUS (*Sh. Commentaries* [1849], 1863, I, 626, 628): The earliest sonnets belong to 1594-1595; all "were written before 1597."

GILDEMEISTER (*Sh.'s Sonette*, 2d ed., 1876, p. vi): Most of the sonnets were written between 1593 and 1597; many may be earlier than *Venus*.

H. D. GRAY (*M. L. N.*, 1917, XXXII, 19): The difference in tone between the early dark-woman sonnets (like 42) and the later (141, 142, 147-152), which

parallel the tone of *Hamlet* and *Timon*, justifies placing the composition of these plays and these later sonnets in the same period.

HERFORD (ed. 1899, p. 373): "From 1590-97, Shakespeare's dramatic writing was influenced by lyric ideals of style. . . . There is a strong presumption that the Sonnets—Shakespeare's consummate achievement in lyric poetry—belong to this period of pronounced lyrical energies," yet (p. 372) 107 belongs to 1603.

HESSEN (*Leben Sh.'s*, 1904, p. 227): The sonnets could have been written at any time from 1585 to 1609; probably 1593-1594 and 1598-1601 were the "most productive" periods.

HUDSON (ed. 1856, p. 116) decided on a date "before 1598" with sonnets "added . . . from time to time." Later (*Sh.: His Life*, 1872, I, 24-26) he announced that fifteen were addressed to Anne Hathaway, some presumably around 1582, others "much later."

JORDAN (*Sh.'s Gedichte*, 1861, p. xxxix): The earliest sonnet was written about 1593, the last not much after 1603.

KENT (*People in Sh.'s Sonnets*, 1915, pp. 9, 18): All were composed "in the summer of the year 1593." They are a unified poem.

KITTREDGE (ed. 1936, p. 1491): "[107] seems to refer to the death of Elizabeth and the accession of James I in 1603. The dates of the rest are not to be determined. They must have been written at different times and on miscellaneous occasions throughout Shakespeare's literary life from *ca.* 1592 to 1609."

KNIGHTS (*Scrutiny*, 1934, III, 134): All the sonnets may be dated "roughly from 1592 to 1597 or 1598."

LANDAUER (*Shakespeare*, 1920, II, 319 f.): "There are correspondences in thought and style . . . which lead from these sonnets to Shakespeare's two great poems of the years 1593 and 1594, and likewise to the early romantic plays, especially *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *Love's Labor's Lost*. . . . Other sonnets, however, in content, mood, and form, are so different, so mature, gloomy, austere, that a later period of composition, up to about 1605 at least, must be assumed. . . . The evolution of these sonnets may, therefore, very well have stretched over about a dozen years."

LARBAUD (*Sh.'s Sonnets*, 1927, p. xxiii): Many of the sonnets are Sh.'s first attempts at writing, earlier than or contemporary with *Love's Labor's Lost*, that is, of 1588-1591.

LEGOUIS (*History*, 1926, p. 200): 1-154 "were written in moments snatched from work for the theatre"—"doubtless between 1594 and 1602."

LUCE (*Sh. the Man*, 1913, p. 60) places the original date of composition in 1594-1597, with revisions extending up to 1609.

MASSON (MS. *Autobiography of Sh.*, 1846, I, 7): "The Sonnets . . . were composed . . . between 1597 and 1602."

MORSBACH (*Göttingen Nachrichten*, 1915, p. 165): "Shakespeare's sonnet period seems to have ended in 1598 at the latest."

MURRY (*Shakespeare*, 1936, pp. 113 f.): "The total experience recorded in the sonnets belongs to the years 1593-95," though some of 127-152 may have been written later.

RALEIGH (*Shakespeare*, 1907, p. 87): "The bulk of the Sonnets were written before 1599."

REED (ed. 1923, pp. 93 f.): "The general impression the sonnets make on the reader" by their resemblances to *Venus* and *Lucrece*, "and by their fluency, their enthusiasm for beauty, their excess of emotion over reflection is that as a whole they are the work of the young Shakespeare." Most of them may be assigned to 1593-1598, though some "were written much later, even in the reign of James I."

RIDLEY (ed. 1934, p. xv): "All the sonnets are later than 1593, and . . . some of them are earlier than 1598. That is all the direct evidence that we have."

ROBERTSON (*Genuine in Sh.*, 1930, pp. 59-62): Lady Southampton commissioned Sh. to write the sonnets. He did so "about 1592," and in *Venus* "he fills up a number of stanzas from the material of the sonnets he had lately written."

ROLFE (*Life*, 1904, p. 365): The majority belong to 1598-1601, but some "may be of later date."

SACHS (*Jahrbuch*, 1890, XXV, 155): "The *love sonnets* fall into the earlier group, describing the sensual affair of Venus and Adonis in an obscene manner, and the love sonnets of 1609, dating from a more mature period, marked by turns of expression which are pointed, witty, often obscure because of too great richness of thought."

SANFELICE (*Rivista d'Italia*, 1898, III, 302): *Venus* was published in 1593. Hence the sonnets must, in large part, go back at least to 1592.

SCHERR (*History of English Literature* [1854], 1882, p. 68): "They were probably composed from 1592-1609."

W. F. SCHIRMER (*Geschichte der englischen Literatur*, 1937, p. 218): "Written 1593-1596, with additions up to 1600."

SECCOMBE and ALLEN (*Age of Sh.*, 1903, I, 25): "A very large proportion" probably belong to 1593-1597.

SIEPER (*Sh. und seine Zeit*, 1913, p. 65): "1594 is the year of origin for the greatest part of the sonnets."

STOPES (ed. 1904, p. liii): They "commenced in 1591, and ran on for some years."

H. W. WELLS (*S. A. B.*, 1937, XII, 122): 1-99 and 126 were composed "about 1594"; 100-125, "about 1598"; 127-154 "belong to the earlier period, about 1594."

FRAYNE WILLIAMS (*Mr. Sh.*, 1941, p. 205): "The Sonnets appear to extend from 1593 until within a few years of their actual publication in 1609."

WOLFF (*Shakespeare*, 1907, I, 287 f.): "It is to be assumed that the sonnets were written at the beginning of the 'nineties. . . . This does not preclude the possibility that some were written earlier or later. . . . A single period of composition cannot be assigned at all, or can be assigned only in a very conditional manner."

WYNDHAM (ed. 1898, p. cviii): The large number of sonnet sequences published in London during 1590-1600 "raises a presumption in favour of an early date" for Sh.'s sonnets, and "this presumption is confirmed by the publication of two of them" in the *P. P.*, 1599. In 104 Sh. tells that "three years had elapsed since he first saw the youth to whom the earlier Sonnets were addressed; and the balance of internal evidence . . . points to the years 1599-1602 as the most probable period for their composition." Further (p. 250), 1-42, 127-154

were written "before, but not long before, 1599"; 104 proves 100-125 "to have been written three years later," and "the melancholy languor, the metaphysical speculation, the poetical perfection" of 56-125 "disclose a near affinity to *Hamlet*, entered in the Stationers' Register, July 26, 1602."

From the foregoing discussion it will be seen that two conjecturers place the initial date of composition in 1582, two or three in 1585, and that the earliest date of completion is set by two in 1588. An average of the guesses indicates that Sh. began writing about the middle of 1593 and laid aside his pen about June, 1599. Perhaps such an average is as reliable a way as has yet been found of "settling" the vexed problem—unless some hardy spirit wishes to argue that Sh. wrote the entire sequence in the totally neglected year 1606. In any case, it should be unnecessary to say here that the date of composition is altogether doubtful. Fortunately Sh.'s eternal numbers have outlived all efforts to establish them in the long date of 1582-1609.

APPENDIX IV

THE ARRANGEMENT

For thirty years after their first publication the sonnets remained undisturbed and apparently almost unread. Then BENSON got out an edition of the so-called *Poems: Written By Wil. Shake-speare*, 1640, in which he reprinted them (see pp. 18-28, above), drastically rearranging them in "poems" varying from one to five sonnets, and supplying a title for each "poem." Accordingly, he is largely responsible for the obsession for uprooting and resetting the sonnets that in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries overmastered many amateur as well as professional scholars. But his motives, though often misunderstood, differed altogether from theirs.

KNIGHT (ed. 1841, pp. 93 f.), himself the first modern rearranger, observed that the 1640 order differed from that of 1609, although it "was altogether arbitrary, and proceeded upon a false conception of many of these poems, . . . but it is remarkable that within twenty-four years of Shakspeare's death an opinion should have existed that the original arrangement was also arbitrary, and that the Sonnets were essentially that collection of *fragments* which Meres described in 1598." Fortified by this opinion, HUDSON (ed. 1856, p. 116) assured his American readers that Benson's edition shows how in 1640 the sonnets, as printed by Thorpe, were looked upon as having no "unity of cause, or purpose, or occasion." Once started, this notion rapidly assumed almost the inviolability of an axiom. For example, ALDEN (ed. 1916, p. 431) asserts of the 1640 *Poems* that "the only significance to be found in its character is negative—to the effect that there was no tradition implying a continuous or two-part text as of 1609"; while LEE (*Life*, 1898, p. 100) speaks of "the historic fact that readers and publishers of the seventeenth century acknowledged no sort of significance in the order in which the poems first saw the light. When the sonnets were printed . . . in 1640 . . . they were presented in a completely different order. The short descriptive titles which were then supplied . . . proved that the collection was regarded as a disconnected series of occasional poems in more or less amorous vein." But, one may ask, what is Lee's "historic fact" worth? It is a fact that *one* publisher, Benson, rearranged the sonnets, but there is no evidence whatever that all publishers and all readers in seventeenth-century England "acknowledged no sort of significance" in the order of Q. Probably very few of them had ever heard of, much less seen, that book, and certainly not all had seen the 1640 edition. Benson himself may, or may not, have regarded the Q order as significant, but he did away with it merely to hide his larceny from Thorpe and Jaggard, owners of the copyrights he was infringing. He pretended to be reproducing hitherto unprinted texts, so that the "historic fact" of his rearrangement has no bearing on the question at issue. There is more point to the admission of ACHESON (*Sh.'s Sonnet Story*, 1922, p. 35), noteworthy for a man of his bent: "We may judge from Benson's edition that whatever autobiographical interest may lie hidden in the Sonnets it had been quite lost sight of by this time." That (if it ever

existed) such interest had been lost sight of is evident from the way in which the pirate publisher changed from male to female the sex of the person addressed by Sh. None the less, the Knight-Lee preconception bobs up on all occasions, G. C. A. JONSON (*Poetry Review*, 1931, XXII, 289), for instance, seeing "the clearest proof" in Benson's volume that the arrangement of Q was not "originally" considered important; while RIDLEY (ed. 1934, p. vii) says that the 1640 text "has some interest as showing that thirty-one years after their original publication the order of the sonnets in . . . [Q] was not regarded as sacrosanct." Actually, as POOLER (ed. 1918, p. x) correctly notes, Benson's "deviation from Thorpe's order is more apparent than real. Many of the sonnets printed with separate titles follow Thorpe's order," as 120 to 125, "and the sonnets printed in groups invariably do so. Occasionally a sonnet is omitted to appear elsewhere with a separate heading, but within the groups a later never precedes an earlier."

In discussing this matter scholars have failed to notice that to rearrange poems was the normal habit of Elizabethan printers, even of those owning the copyrights of the books they were reprinting, a habit based upon a natural desire to make later editions look new. Thus the second edition of *Tottel's Miscellany*, appearing eight weeks after the first, was entirely rearranged with a number of poems dropped and others added. Exactly the same thing is true of the 1578, 1580, and 1585 editions of *The Paradise of Dainty Devices*, 1576, of the 1608, 1611, and 1621 editions of *A Poetical Rhapsody*, 1602, and of dozens of other works. Benson, then, was merely conforming to fashion; but, since he was violating the copyrights of other publishers, he had a double reason for wishing to give the *Poems* an air of newness.

As I have already shown (pp. 29-36, above), the 1640 arrangement held the field for more than a century and a half in the editions of GILDON, SEWELL, EWING, GENTLEMAN, and others. Even after STEEVENS and MALONE had resurrected Thorpe's quarto in 1766, 1780, and 1790, certain editors as late as 1817 continued to follow Benson. Apparently it did not occur to Malone and his immediate successors that the order followed in Q was suspect. If they believed Thorpe, not Sh., responsible for it, at least they failed to say so; or possibly they realized the great unlikelihood of improving on his work. Yet it was the usual thing, when an author did not supervise the printing of his book, for Elizabethan and Jacobean publishers to edit, title, and arrange poems as they saw fit. A classic illustration is Sidney's *Arcadia*, 1590 (1912 ed., I, 4), to which the publisher William Ponsonby prefixed a note: "The division and summing of the Chapters was not of Sir *Philip Sidneis* dooing, but adventured by the over-seer of the print, for the more ease of the Readers. He therefore submits himselfe to their judgement, and if his labour answer not the worthines of the booke, desireth pardon for it. . . . [As for the poems, or eclogues,] at this time they have bene chosen and disposed as the over-seer thought best." If, as most scholars believe, Q was a volume unauthorized by Sh., manifestly there can be no assurance that it represents with any degree of accuracy his own classification of the poems. Yet exactly the opposite assumption—that we have the sonnets printed entirely or with unimportant variations in the sequence Sh. himself sponsored—underlies the arguments of most defenders of the existing order.

Furthermore, several of the more popular autobiographical interpretations of the sonnets depend to a large extent on the acceptance of the Q arrangement. MALONE and STEEVENS (ed. 1780, p. 682), for instance, initiated in England and ESCHENBURG (*Ueber W. Sh.*, 1787, p. 572) in Germany the still widely held notion that 1-126 were addressed to a man, 127-154 to a woman—a notion that may almost be called (if anything about the sonnets can be so called) the orthodox view. But they did not vex their minds with theories about the chronology, continuity, or autobiography of the sonnets—which is just as well, for otherwise they would have left very little, except endless repetition (it came anyhow), for later editors and commentators to add.

The most influential early defender of the *status quo* in Germany was REGIS (*Sh.-Almanach*, 1836) and in England C. A. BROWN. Regis believed (pp. 311 f.) that, to understand the sonnets, one must read them consecutively from 1 to 154. The following are "cohesive groups, in which the . . . order is never disturbed or reversed": 1-6; 9, 10; 15-17; 23, 24; 27, 28; 29-31; 33-35; 36, 37; 38, 39; 40-42; 44, 45; 46, 47; 50-52; 57, 58; 62-65; 67, 68; 69, 70; 71-74; 78-80; 82-85; 87-93; 94-96; 97-99; 100, 101; 102, 103; 104-106; 109-112; 113, 114; 115, 116; 117-119; 121-123; 124, 125; 126; 130, 131; 135, 136; 139, 140; 146-150; 151, 152; 153, 154. The intervening poems merely reflect the varying moods of the relationship. 129 and 146, however, which (p. 246) "have a general ethical content" hardly belong in the second series (127-154). Nevertheless, all twenty-eight might be inserted (pp. 313 f.) after 40-42, which deal with the same subject as 133, 134, and 144. Regis's comments were often repeated. As late as 1923 LUDWIG translated the sonnets and united 40-42 with 133 and 134 into a group called "Double Betrayal," numbered 129-133 in his arrangement. His translation was included in BAB's *Sh.s Werke*, 1924, volume IX;¹ and in 1925 BAB (*Shakespeare*, pp. 207 f.) expressed hearty approval of the Regis-Ludwig scheme, saying that only in the position of 40-42 is Q certainly at fault.

BROWN himself had often discussed Sh.'s lyrics with Landor. He broke into print "after a lapse of ten years," dedicating *Sh.'s Autobiographical Poems*, 1838, to that Old Lion, who (see pp. 353 f., below) had small esteem for English sonnets. His thesis was (pp. 44-47) that, properly speaking, Sh.'s are not sonnets at all, but are instead six poems in sonnet stanzas, five of them addressed to Sh.'s friend, "and, still more extraordinary, each poem concluding with an appropriate *Envoy*," the sixth to his mistress. The "key" thus discovered "unlocks every difficulty, and we have nothing but pure uninterrupted biography." Brown removed all obstacles, so he was confident, by a schematic analysis, which may be tabulated as follows:

First Poem. To his friend, persuading him to marry: 1-26

Second Poem. To his friend, who had robbed the poet of his mistress, forgiving him: 27-55

Third Poem. To his friend, complaining of his coldness, and warning him of life's decay: 56-77

¹ This information comes from Bab's 1925 book. I have not seen his 1924 *Werke* or Ludwig's translation.

Fourth Poem. To his friend, complaining that he prefers another poet's praises, and reproving him for faults that may injure his character: 78-101

Fifth Poem. To his friend, excusing himself for having been some time silent, and disclaiming the charge of inconstancy: 102-126

Sixth Poem. To his mistress, on her infidelity: 127-152

He was certain that 145 and 146 should be expunged from the Sixth Poem, although (p. 97) "it is remarkable that they are placed exactly where there seems to have been a pause or division; the first part being written in doubt and jealousy, and the after part in certainty of the woman's infidelity," and, like many subsequent critics, he believed (p. 98) that 153 and 154 belong, not to the main sequence, but "to nothing but themselves."

C. W. DILKE published in the *Athenaeum* (July 21, 1838, pp. 508-510) a highly unfavorable review of Brown's book. The two men had once been friends in John Keats's circle, but, as Dilke wrote to George Keats¹ in September, 1838, "our formal civility terminated lately because we did not flatter him about a silly book which he was pleased to publish." None the less, for a short time Brown's classification met with favor, as in the *G. M.*, 1838 (n. s., X, 164-168), and the *Dublin Review*, 1838 (V, 336). In 1839 ULRICI (*Sh.'s Dramatic Art*, 1846, p. 129), unaware of Brown's theory, insisted that the sonnets "can only be rightly understood in the order" of Q, while HALLAM (*Introduction*, III, 289), giving it an approving nod, remarked that "they may easily be resolved into several series according to their subjects." COLLIER (ed. 1843, pp. 474 f.), too, saw in Brown's "the best solution of various difficulties"; and it was approved by DAWSON before 1876 (*Shakespeare*, 1888, pp. 36 f.), by CALVERT (*Shakespeare*, pp. 69-71) and C. D. DESHLER (*Afternoons with the Poets*, pp. 68 f.) in 1879, and by APPLETON MORGAN in 1882 (*Some Shakespearean Commentators*, p. 19) and in 1884 (*Manhattan*, III, 449 f.).

Others, though trusting Q, could not go so far. MASSON in 1846 (*MS. Autobiography of Sh.*, volume I: see p. 93, below) expressed his admiration for Brown's scheme without being able to accept it. He divided the sequence into eight "Papers": (1) 1-26, (2) 27-32, (Intercalated Paper) 127-154, (3) 33-55, (4) 56-77, (5) 78-99, (6) 100-107, (7) 108-126. The order of 1-126 seemed to him correct, but the final "miscellaneous" sonnets he transposed (I, 12) as follows on the basis of "their historical principle" thus: 127, 128, 130, 153, 154, 145, 135, 136, 143, 131, 132, 137-142, 148-152, 146, 129, 144, 133, 134, 147. BARRETT (*American [Whig] Review*, 1847, VI, 305) wrote: "The order . . . has the poet's sanction. It is evidently just as it should be. All conspires to a perfect unity. . . . As soon may we change the order of lines or words, as separate a single sonnet from the numeral that precedes it." The German scholar GERVINUS (*Shakespeare* [1849], 1863, I, 621, 631), repeating Regis's comment on the identity of plot-characters in 40-42 and 133, 134, and 144, announced that the sonnets are "divided into different groups, each of which touches on a distinct subject; but in the separation and characterizing of these groups we differ partly from the attempts of Brown." The clusters he enumerates (pp. 635-648) are quite as fanciful as the Englishman's. BELL (ed. 1855, pp. 151 f.) characterized Brown's six "poems" as "obtained by a process of

¹ The letter is in the Lowell Collection at Harvard.

reasoning which is calculated to excite surprise rather than to produce conviction." The sonnets were "written as distinct pieces, and never intended to be grouped into consecutive poems." Apparently "with the sanction" of Sh., they were published as separate poems, numbered 1 to 154, and "we have no right to disturb this arrangement." BATHURST (*Remarks*, 1857, p. 113) adopted this latter notion: "From the connection of subjects, they are, for the most part, evidently in order; though not, as has been said, in the nature of continuous stanzas of entire poems." JORDAN (*Sh.'s Gedichte*, 1861, p. xxxix) discovered in Q "artful editing and revising," so that five main groups, or books, are readily discernible (1-32; 33-77; 78-99; 100-126; 127-154).

"Most of those who have written on the Sonnets," says RICHARD SIMPSON (*Introduction*, 1868, pp. 36-46) none too accurately, "have taken it for granted that their order is merely accidental, and have therefore taken the liberty of arranging them in new groups." This liberty he assails, because Sh. wrote the lyrics for Mr. W. H. "in definite series, intended to illustrate the progress" of Platonic philosophy. "We ought therefore to suppose, till the contrary is demonstrated, that the order in which they stand is that which was intended by their author." Each series, 1-125, 127-152 ("for 126 is merely a tag or appendix to the first series, as 153 and 154 are to the second"), runs the "Platonic 'scale of love'" with its two great divisions, imaginative love and ideal love. Furthermore, "the two series of sonnets . . . run parallel to each other; the first comprises all that the second possesses, and much more besides; for the love of friendship is treated more fully than the love of desire." Simpson works out his hypothesis schematically, proving "beyond all reasonable doubt that the present arrangement is the right one"; but the evidence has been accepted by very few of his successors.

NEIDHARDT (*Sh.'s kleinere Dichtungen*, 1870, pp. vi f., xiv) thought no changes necessary, but he added to the original numbers those of the BODENSTEDT (1866) rearrangement as a matter of "fair play" to readers. HENRY BROWN (*Sonnets of Sh.*, 1870, p. 13) pleaded that unless the Q order is retained, the sonnets "have no meaning at all, every attempt at rearrangement having proved a total failure." He agreed with the earlier Brown that "they are . . . arranged as consecutive stanzas, in the manner in which Thorpe undoubtedly received them in the manuscript which Shakespeare himself wrote." MINTO (*Characteristics*, 1874, pp. 282 f.) disagreed with C. A. Brown, yet found it "unmistakable that there is a sequence in them, not only to this extent that several consecutive sonnets are occupied with the same theme, but to this further extent that the themes are consecutive. . . . Certainly there is no justification for . . . treating the sonnets as if they had been written on separate slips to different persons for different purposes, and shuffled together by the publisher." FLEAY (*Macmillan's*, 1875, XXXI, 434, 445) also protested that 1-125 form a "continuous poem," so that we have "no right to disturb the arrangement" in any way. They are stanzas, not isolated and separable sonnets. The early editors, too, sometimes exemplified their belief that the sonnets are "stanzas," correctly disposed in Q, by ending the fourteenth line with a semicolon or colon, as in 44, 73, 91, 92, 98, 123.

FURNIVALL (ed. 1877, pp. lxiii-lxvi) concludes that the "arrangement by Groups is some evidence that it is Shakspeare's own." He "analyses" them

in considerable detail, dividing Group I (1-126) into fifteen sections (1-25; 26-32; 33-35; 36-39; 40-42; 43-61; 62-65; 66-70; 71-74; 75-77; 78-93; 94-96; 97-99; 100-121; 122-126) with subsections running down the Greek alphabet to beta, gamma, or delta; Group II (127-154) into eleven sections (127; 128; 129; 130; 131, 132; 133-136; 137-145; 146 ["? Misplaced"]; 147, 148; 149-152; 153, 154). Like many others, he is willing to call 153 and 154 Group III. SPALDING (*G. M.*, 1878, CCXLII, 300-302) objects to the custom of treating the sonnets as "counters, to be transposed and re-arranged according to the exigencies of the view to be supported." He argues that 1-126, addressed to an unknown friend over a period of "possibly about three years, . . . were not intended, at the time when they were written, to form a consecutive poem, . . . but were subsequently strung together in the order in which we now possess them, and which is approximately, if not actually, chronological." Who did the stringing is not specified—presumably Sh. himself. Spalding distributed 1-126 in three classes with various sections that scarcely need itemizing:

- I. From familiarity to friendship: 1-25
- II. Clouds: 26-96
- III. Reconciliation: 97-126

About 1880 D. G. ROSSETTI wrote to HALL CAINE (*Recollections*, 1882, p. 250): "There should be an essential reform in the printing of Shakspeare's sonnets. After sonnet 125 should occur the words *End of Part I*. The couplet-piece, numbered 126, should be called *Epilogue to Part I*. Then, before 127, should be printed *Part II*. After 152, should be put *End of Part II*.—and the two last sonnets should be called *Epilogue to Part II*." From a poet who had himself written a sonnet sequence of great merit this support of Q is interesting. It was quickly duplicated by DOWDEN (ed. 1881), perhaps the most steadfast adherent of the conventional numbering, who remarked (p. 2): "Repeated perusals have convinced me that the Sonnets stand in the right order, and that sonnet is connected with sonnet in more instances than have been observed." For this belief, various arguments are presented (p. 24): "That the Sonnets are not printed in the Quarto . . . at haphazard, is evident from the fact that the *Envoy* (CXXVI.) is rightly placed; that poems addressed to a mistress follow those addressed to a friend; and that the two Cupid and Dian Sonnets stand together at the close. A nearer view makes it apparent that in the first series, I.-CXXVI., a continuous story is conducted through various stages to its termination. . . . We are in the end convinced that no arrangement which has been proposed is as good as that of the Quarto." But, he adds, these comments apply only to 1-126. The second series (127-154) "does not exhibit a like intelligible sequence; a better arrangement may perhaps be found." Further evidence is to be found in the interchange of the personal pronouns *thou* and *you* (p. 25): "In the first fifty sonnets *you* is of extremely rare occurrence; in the second fifty *you* and *thou* alternate in little groups of sonnets, *thou* having still a preponderance, but now only a slight preponderance; in the remaining twenty-six *you* becomes the ordinary mode of address, and *thou* the exception. In the sonnets to a mistress, *thou* is invari-

ably employed."¹ ROLFE, whose edition (1883) is partly a reprint of Dowden's, announced (p. 5) that the more he pondered the question, the more he was inclined to think 1-126 "a regular series." The sonnets are "*nearly* in their proper order; but . . . if Shakespeare had read the proof-sheets, he might have made some transpositions." But (p. 12) "the order seems . . . more like that of a *collector* . . . than that of the *author*." GISSING, 1883 (*Letters*, 1927 ed., p. 133), however, got from Q "a fairly satisfactory understanding," by subdividing the sonnets so as to begin "a new canto with 40, another with 43 and the last with 127."

In 1885 a *Blackwood's* writer (CXXXVII, 774 f., 779) presented a novel thesis: that Sh. "framed the *structure* of the Sonnets, considered as a continuous poem, according to the pattern set before him by Dante" in the *Vita Nuova*. Sh.'s lyrics are "not only carefully numbered and detailed by their author . . . but [are] also to be set in their adjusted places according to their designed relation to the main idea and purpose of the poet." They are "divided into proemium, theme, and auxiliary, but each sub-poem divides itself according to the sonnets occurring in it" exactly as the *Vita Nuova* is divided. Unimpressed by these details, VERITY (ed. 1890, p. 403) closely reproduced Dowden's reasoning: "Their present order is by no means haphazard. Supposing . . . that they were written at different times, we should expect a certain amount of interdependence and connection; and this is precisely what we find. Time after time some word or idea that occurs in one sonnet is repeated or developed in the next. . . . I cannot myself imagine any order preferable to that of the Quarto: I know no sound objection to it; and in any case, to rearrange the poems is a work of the merest futility and supererogation, for the very simple reason that no one has ever endorsed anybody else's ideas on the subject."

This more or less orthodox opinion is restated by TYLER (ed. 1890, pp. 5-7), GRIFFIN (*English Writers*, 1895, XI, 327-334), GOLLANCZ (ed. 1896, pp. vi, xxvii-xxix), and WYNDHAM (ed. 1898). TYLER sees in Q three series of sonnets: (1) 1-126 addressed to a male friend, (2) 127-152 "concerned mainly with . . . the poet's mistress," (3) 153, 154 "which have a character of their own." 100-126 are "a single poem." 1-154 are printed in the order of their composition. "The burden of proof lies on those who object to the order in which the Sonnets were first printed. It is for them to show that the order thus given is not the right order." "There can be no doubt," says GRIFFIN, "that . . . [1-126], and the whole body of sonnets, were purposely arranged as they now stand. The suggested revised arrangements by writers like Bodenstedt, F. V. Hugo, and Stengel are quite futile." Though 127-152 are "*disjecta membra*," the first series falls into three parts:

- I. Sunshine: 1-26
- II. Clouds: 27-96 (with "eight smaller divisions")
- III. Reconciliation and Retrospect: 97-126

To GOLLANCZ "the Sonnets, as printed in 1609, present on the whole an orderly arrangement, though here and there it is somewhat difficult to find the connecting links. If it could be proved that any one Sonnet is out of place, the whole

¹ On these pronouns see pp. 91, 95, 104 f., below, and the notes to 13.

chain would perhaps be spoilt, but no such 'broken link' can be adduced." He analyzes the sequence thus:

- A. "The Better Angel": 1-126
 - I. Love's Adoration: 1-26. (26 is an envoy, followed by an "Interval.")
 - II. Love's Trials: 27-99. (32, 42, 55, 75, 96, 99 are envoys, each followed by an "Interval," that after 99 being "a year or two.")
 - III. Love's Triumph: 100-126. (126 is the envoy.)
- B. "The Worser Spirit": 127-152
- C. "Love's Fire": 153, 154

WYNDHAM (p. cix) assures us that "the Sonnets, as we find them in the Quarto of 1609, whether or not they were edited by Shakespeare, must so far have commanded his approval as to arouse no protest against the form in which they appeared. It would have been as easy for him to re-shuffle and re-publish as it is impossible to believe that he could so re-shuffle and re-publish, and no record of his action survive." The first series, 1-125, closed by an envoy (126), Wyndham explains, is "addressed to a youth"; in the second, "seventeen out of twenty-eight are addressed to the author's mistress, and the others comment, more or less directly, on her infidelity and on his infatuation. Most critics—indeed all not quixotically compelled to reject a reasonable view—are agreed that the order in the First Series can scarce be bettered." Furthermore (pp. cx-cxvi), Series I is divided into seven main groups:

- A. 1-19, followed by playful occasional verses, 20-25
- B. 26-32
- C. 33-42, followed by 43-52, "connected or occasional pieces on mere absence," and 53-55, which "return to the theme of immortalising"
- D. 56-74, followed by 75-77
- E. 78-86
- F. 87-96, followed by 97-99, which "emphasise the break" in Series I
- G. 100-125, followed by the envoy, 126

Series II "shows fewer traces of design in its sequence." 129, 146, 153, 154 scarcely belong to it, "but the rest are, all of them, addressed to a Dark Lady whom Shakespeare loved . . . or they comment on the wrong she does him." Undoubtedly they were written at the same time as 33-42 (Group C).

BRANDES (*William Sh.*, 1898, I, 316) hardly grappled with the problem. To him the sonnets "are not isolated poems. We very soon discern that they stand in an intimate relation to each other, a thought or motive suggested in one being developed more at length in the next or one of the subsequent Sonnets. The grouping proves to be by no means arbitrary, as was once thought to be the case; on the contrary, it is so careful that all attempts to alter it have only rendered the poems more obscure." HERFORD (ed. 1899, pp. 373 f.) likewise saw little reason to question Q. 1-126 "are addressed to a youth"; of the remainder "seventeen are addressed to the poet's mistress, and the majority of the rest utter his bitter reflections upon the fatuous passion she has inspired." This second series may not represent accurately Sh.'s arrangement; the first series in general does, though possibly 97-99 are misplaced.

In the strange book of CREIGHTON (*Sh.'s Story*, 1904, p. 19) Q found a fervid admirer, who, however, substitutes assertion for evidence. "How can any one maintain," he asks indignantly, that Q "had not been prepared for the press by the author himself? The longer sequence of . . . [1-126] is, at all events, a natural order, which hardly admits of rearrangement, and must have been designed." But a bare two years later NEILSON (ed. 1906, p. 1170) slightly wandered from the path of orthodoxy: "There is nothing but internal evidence to tell us whether the order in which they appear in . . . [Q] is due to the poet. A certain amount of reason in the . . . [Q] arrangement is admitted by all." LUCE (*Handbook*, 1906, pp. 94 f.), urging that the Q sequence be retained ("no better has yet been devised"), divides 1-126 into six groups (1-32; 33-42; 43-74; 75-96; 97-99; 100-126) with possibly a break at 58. 127-152 may be addressed to two different women; 153 and 154 "stand apart." The grouping of Q, RALEIGH (*Shakespeare*, 1907, p. 87) next remarks, "has never been bettered," for there the sonnets "often fall into natural groups of ten, twelve, or fourteen, closely connected by the sense." But it is impossible for all students to grasp "the sense." Just as Raleigh was using its aid to determine the "natural groups," VON KRALIK (*Kultur*, 1907, VIII, 387-392) was discovering six totally different groups of his own (1-26; 27-55; 56-77; 78-99; 100-125 followed by the extraneous 126; 127-152) plus an epilogue (153, 154). MACKAIL (*Lectures*, 1911, pp. 202-205), too, was led by "the sense" to other conclusions: first, that 127-154 are an appendix "arranged in no traceable order," "a miscellaneous addition, which may have reached Thorpe from the same source as the main body of the Sonnets or may have been put together by him from more than one source"; and, second, that 1-126 "were arranged by Shakespeare, or at all events that they left his hands, in their present order, and that this order is substantially the order of their composition." These latter fall into three main groups: (1) 1-25, and "then a considerable gap of time"; (2) 27-76 ("26 is an introductory or covering Sonnet," 77 "an occasional Sonnet sent with the gift of an album, and not properly belonging to the series"); (3) 78-125 (122 is "intercalated, without any obvious relevance," 126 is an "envoi"). Twenty years later MACKAIL (*Approach to Sh.*, 1930, p. 116) was still convinced that the sonnets fall into two main divisions, 1-125 plus an envoy (126), and "a miscellaneous and disorderly appendix" of 127-152, which has "no structural connexion" with the first group. 153 and 154 are not by Sh.

Earlier BRANDL (*Sh.'s Sonette*, 1913, pp. vii-xxvi), asserting that the order of Q should be retained since it carries the authority of Thorpe and perhaps even of Sh., had called attention to the subdivisions 1-17, 18-74, 75-86, 87-126, ("an unordered mass" with no evidence of editing), 127-152, and 153 and 154 (an appendage). The same ideas he reexpressed in his *Shakespeare*, 1922, 1937 (pp. 154 f.). The more often ROEDDER (*Sh.'s Sonette*, 1913, p. 11) perused the sonnets, the more he was convinced that they have been transmitted, by and large, in the chronological order of their composition, and that the arrangement is Sh.'s. KENT's idea (*People in Sh.'s Sonnets*, 1915, pp. 26 f., 37, 50 f.) was that Sh. wrote the sonnets in a book, which he sent to Southampton, and which was confiscated by officials when they searched the house of the earl after his arrest in 1601. The "purloiner" ultimately sold it to Thorpe, in whose edition

of 1609 (p. 27) "no student . . . can fail to see that each Sonnet is in its right order." Q has (pp. 16 f.) eleven "sets" of fourteen sonnets each. "The major part, or symphony, consists of nine sets, ending with Sonnet 126, . . . [which] is the *finale* to the first *theme*, or symphony." Of the remainder, 127-144 "have their *finale* in Sonnet 145," 146-152 theirs in 153 and 154. "The Sonnets thus form one definite and pre-arranged composition, and there is no casual work about them." Kent's rigid orthodoxy is enforced by uncomplimentary remarks ("ignoramus," "ass," "humbug") that he hurls against the corpses of his predecessors.

More urbanely, if with doubtful validity, LANDAUER (*Shakespeare*, 1920, II, 319) gives his decision: "One can no more doubt that the highly artistic order is the poet's own than that Goethe arranged his own poems." O. F. EMERSON (*S. P.*, 1923, XX, 131) protests against the "insecure notion" that the order of Q is not Sh.'s: it is "the best we are likely to have, and all things considered the assumption that it is the original order is the only one at all satisfying." His general ideas are reenforced by ADAMS (*Life*, 1923, p. 173 n.): "The order in which . . . [Q] gives the sonnets seems to be in the main, if not completely, that in which Shakespeare arranged them. Where links are discoverable, and they are numerous, the order is demonstrably correct; moreover, in many cases where there is no formal link but a continuity in thought, the order is again correct."

All too frequently approval of the 1609 distribution is inextricably mixed with theories—not always presented as theories—about the identity of the friend or the mistress. FORBIS (*Shakespearean Enigma*, 1924, p. 3) surely deserves a word in this connection. "The consecutive order of the quarto is . . . with a few exceptions . . . the order in which they [the sonnets] were composed," he vouchsafes, before going on to titillate us with the discovery that the friend and the dark woman are nothing but a dipsomaniac's personification of wine. FORT's theory (*Two Dated Sonnets*, 1924, p. 23), by comparison, seems sedate, even commonplace. He cannot be convinced that, "if 126 undated letters [or sonnets] were once separated or thrown into disorder, they could ever be rearranged in such a manner that they seemed to present a continuous narrative. . . . I believe that in fact the order which he [Thorpe] adopted was an authoritative one." He believes (pp. 16-19) also that 1-126 were written to Southampton; that (pp. 46 f.) 127-152 concern, not Sh. himself, but Lord Pembroke and a "dark siren"; that 153, 154 are society verse for "a lady who was about to stay at Bath." But quickly (*Time Scheme*, 1929, p. 91) he changed his mind, declaring that 127-152 deal with the same incidents as 33-42. Another steadfast admirer of Q, MURRY (*New Adelphi*, 1929, II, 251), objects to concluding, "against the evidence of our senses, that the Sonnets are a mere hotch-potch arranged in any order. On the contrary, the order . . . seems substantially correct, and none of the many attempts to establish a new order has ever been really convincing." This last, oft-repeated remark is, one must emphasize, not in any sense an argument that the order of Q is correct.

It is interesting to find RENDALL (*Sh. Sonnets*, 1930, p. 290), a satellite of the Earl of Oxford as "Sh.," saying that "for critical minds of a certain type disintegration theories have special fascination," but that their "random

shafts have done little to impair or shake the sense of inherent unity." Ignoring the disintegration theory supported by himself, he remarks: "As to sequence, the signs all point to preservation of the order in which they were originally composed; back references all fall correctly into place, and so, too, the verbal links of thought, phrase, figure or rhyme, which connect successive or companion sonnets." Of the same general nature are the comments of CHAMBERS (*William Sh.*, 1930, I, 560 f.): "The unity of the sonnets is one of atmosphere. The thread of incident is a frail one. Each sonnet is generally self-contained. A few are linked. On the other hand, there is occasionally a jar in the continuity, which may suggest misplacement." "Subjectivity has had full swing," he adds, in the revisers of the order of Q.

J. MÜLLER (*Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, 1932, XX, 6 f.), investigating the cyclic principle of lyrics,¹ admits that Sh.'s sonnets are not necessarily arranged according to plan, that some may have been lost; yet two elements required in every cycle are present here. There is first the center of gravity, to which every sonnet tends to be related. In Sh. that center is love. But there is also a *thematic a priori* underlying the language variations of the sonnets as their *primus motor*. In 1-126 this prime mover is "love for a beautiful youth," which is, of course, the basic experience, the experience center of all these poems. In 127-154 the *thematic a priori*, the basic, motivating impulse, is "love for a dark woman." The two elements, a center of reference and a *thematic a priori*, suffice to make the cycle a formal category. The Shakespearean sonnets prove this sufficiently; they constitute a cycle, even though the connections between individual poems are loose. WOLFGANG SCHMIDT (*Anglia*, 1938, LXII, 287) judges from parallels in style and theme with the other poems and the plays that the sonnets were printed in an order corresponding pretty closely to that of their composition. YOUNG (*Sonnets of Sh.*, 1937, pp. 71-73) is much more dogmatic: the 1609 order must be kept "if these sonnets are to be correctly understood." "Thorpe had no motive for re-arranging them." He "must have got hold of a recent and complete copy" prepared by Sh. We must accept his "as the order in which Shakespeare wished them to stand." "It is just as impertinent to take . . . [107] out of its proper position and place it at the end as it would be to take the final scene of *Hamlet* and shove it somewhere into the middle of the third act." FRIPP's opinion (*Shakespeare*, 1938, I, 265, 323-325) is similar, but he supplies the information that 1-26 are "a complete set of poems" plus an envoy, and that 27-126 are a "Century" like Watson's *Passionate Century of Love*.

Finally, F. Y. ST. CLAIR, after a long study of the whole problem, sends me his tentative conclusions: "Q was entirely a publisher's venture, with which the author had no voluntary or conscious connection. Thorpe, or whoever did the editing for him, can have been actuated only by the desire to set forth his wares to the best advantage. Sh.'s reputation as poet rested in 1609 upon *Venus* and *Lucrece*. The editor shrewdly put first, therefore, those sonnets (1-17) which were most nearly in the manner of *Venus*. He put last the unpleasant, incomplete, and puzzling Dark Lady series. So Drayton in 1599, when he revised his sonnets, arranged them in order to attract readers, generally

¹ See pp. 423-425, below.

placing towards the end those which he thought less pleasing." St. Clair sees two main divisions. "The first group falls naturally into the subdivisions 1-17, 18-99, 100-126; the second ends with 152, leaving 153 and 154 to stand by themselves. The subdivisions, however, offer difficulties. The diction and tone of 100-110 resemble those of 90-99; the diction and tone of 111-125 are somewhat more like those of 127-152. Again, certain sonnets (127-131, 137) resemble sonnets in the first main group, rather strikingly, in diction, tone, and attitudes. The order in which the groups were written is: (a) 127-152, (b) 1-99, (c) 100-126."

Probably enough, C. A. BROWN's overinsistence in 1838 on the sanctity of Q encouraged skepticism. Before his book appeared there had been doubters, especially among those familiar with the 1640 *Poems*. In Germany as early as 1821, TIECK (*Buch über Sh.*, ed. Henry Lüdeke, 1920, p. 438; see also *Penelope Taschenbuch*, 1826, p. 336) wrote to a friend that the sonnets "are in the greatest disorder; I believe I can arrange them chronologically and in chapters and, if you wish, will send you this arrangement, for indeed in these poems our whole understanding, properly speaking, of Shakespeare lies." Again, RICHARDSON (*G. M.*, 1835, n. s., IV, 369) attributed the editing of the sonnets to "an ignorant bookseller," who confused them into "a painful puzzle."¹ Another early skeptic, the anonymous author of the preposterous "Confessions of William Sh." (*New Monthly Magazine*, 1835, XLIII, 308), speaks of "the strange and confused jumble of arrangement, or rather non-arrangement, into which the printer has flung them," but without going into details. KNIGHT's position (ed. 1841, p. 126) was that in Q were printed, "without the cognizance of the author, all the Sonnets which could be found attributed to Shakspeare; that some of these formed a group of continuous poems; that some were detached; that no exact order could be preserved; and that accident has arranged them in the form in which they first were handed down to us." He was interested in this matter because (pp. 94 f.) "upon the question of the *continuity* of the Sonnets depend many important considerations with reference to the life and personal character of the poet. . . . It is scarcely conceivable that in the earlier edition of 1609 these verses were intended to be presented as 'an integral poem.'" On the contrary, "without the consent of the writer the . . . Sonnets—some forming a continuous poem, or poems; others isolated, in the subjects to which they relate, and the persons to whom they were addressed—were collected together without any key to their arrangement, and given to the public." They were assembled by Mr. W. H., some "ten, or twelve, or fifteen years" after their composition, and arranged "in the most arbitrary manner," and "the assumption of continuity, however ingeniously it may be maintained, is altogether fallacious." Knight does not pretend to have discovered "any real order in which these extraordinary productions may be arranged." He merely strives for one which "does not attempt to reject the idea that a continuous poem, or rather several continuous poems, may be traced throughout the series," and which "does no violence to the meaning of

¹ In his *Literary Leaves*, 2d ed., 1840, II, 38, he describes C. A. Brown as obtaining "more boldness and ingenuity in his arrangement than accuracy or truth."

the author by a pertinacious adherence to a principle of continuity." To his eternal honor—any collater of the sonnets, like an unlettered clerk, will cry "Amen"—Knight follows the Q order in his text, and then in a sort of appendix reprints 1-152 redistributed into three groups:

I. Will (Juvenilia): 135, 136, 143; Black eyes (to Anne Hathaway?): 127, 131, 132; The virginal: 128; False compare: 130, 21; Tyranny: 139, 140, 149; Slavery: 57, 58; Coldness: 56; I hate not you: 145; The little love god (not reprinted): 153, 154; Love and hatred: 129, 137, 138, 141, 142, 147, 148, 150-152; Infidelity: 133, 134, 144; Injury: 33-35, 40-42; A friend's faults: 94-96; Forgiveness: 118-120. (These are all "that appear to have reference to the subject of love.")

II. Confiding friendship: 29-32; Humility: 36-39; Absence: 50-52, 27, 28, 61, 43-45; Estrangement: 48, 75, 49, 88-93; A second absence: 97-99; Fidelity: 109-117, 122-125; Dedications: 26, 25, 23; The picture: 24, 46, 47; The notebook: 77; Rivalry: 76, 78-80, 82-87; Reputation: 121; The soul: 146

III. 1-19; 20, 53; 54, 55; 100-108, 59, 60, 126; 22, 62-74, 81. (These sonnets are addressed "to some youth, some imaginary person.")

Knight's comments are interesting and modest, but, in all innocence, he started a game that promises never to end. If our wives do not write novels and our daughters plays, they are likely on no provocation at all to malarrange Sh.'s lyrics.

In America J. S. HART (*Sartain's Magazine*, 1849, V, 155, 217 f.) reproduced the arrangements of Benson (1640), Brown (1838), and Knight, expressing a general, though not a complete, preference for the last; and HUDSON (ed. 1856, pp. 120-122), whose best lay in dressing old words new, paid Knight his customary tribute of imitation. He reprints Q, though he is "far from thinking this order to be the right one." Knight's seems to him as, with a few trivial exceptions, satisfactory, and by renumbering he indicates the unimportant redistribution he prefers. In his 1881 edition HUDSON drops his references to Knight and his complicated system of two or three numbers to a sonnet, though (pp. 85 f.) he still believes Q incorrect.

Here was a sport that quickly appealed to non-English-speaking students. One of them, "Dr. D.," in a preface to Sh.'s *Complete Works*, Leipzig, 1854 (p. iv), mendaciously announced that the sonnets "do *not* form a whole as they have been printed in all the previous editions. Nevertheless it required some courage to depart from the order of the poems hitherto observed; this the editor has ventured to do by grouping the sonnets which are evidently connected by similarity of contents, under proper superscriptions." Why "courage" was required is apparent, for Dr. D. took over without notice or change Knight's 1841 order and subject-headings—a fact curiously overlooked by ALDEN (ed. 1916, p. 437), who reproduced (from an 1864 reprint) Dr. D.'s scheme in full, and (following the British Museum catalog) identified its "originator" as DELIUS. One can only hope that the identification is not correct. At any rate, in his fully signed editions of the sonnets and in an article of 1865 (*Jahrbuch*, I, 35 f.) DELIUS retained the haphazard Q order, not because it is Sh.'s, but because it is traditional.

In 1857 F.-V. HUGO issued his French prose translation of the sonnets, re-

jecting the Q order because it is neither logical nor chronological. Since the sonnets largely deal with the rivalry of a humble stage-player and a nobleman for the favors of a married woman, the pirate Thorpe, fearing the censor and the wrath of Southampton, did not dare set forth plainly the well-known but scandalous story. He wished to make money, but he prudently recast the sequence, changing what is a dramatic poem into isolated sonnets. Hugo's scheme is:

I. 135, 136, 143, 145, 128, *P. P.* VIII, 139, 140, 127, 131, 132, 130, 21, 149, 137, 138, 147, 148, 141, 150, 142, 152-154, 151, 129

II. 133, 134, 144

III. 33-35, 40-42

IV. 26, 23, 25, 20, 24, 46, 47, 29-31, 121, 36, 66, 39, 50, 51, 48, 52, 75, 56, 27, 28, 61, 43-45, 97-99, 53, 109-120, 77, 122-125, 94-96, 69, 67, 68, 70, 49, 88-93, 57, 58, 78, 79, 38, 80, 82-87, 32

V. 146

VI. 100-103, 105, 76, 106, 59

VII. 126, 104, 1-19, 60, 73, 37, 22, 62, 71, 72, 74, 81, 64, 63, 65, 54, 55, 108, 107

Knight inspired CARTWRIGHT (ed. 1859) to read the sonnets, for the first time in thirty years (p. 4), "merely as an amusement or mental exercise." Wonderful indeed were the results. First, a fanciful division of the lyrics into four parts based (p. 15) on the date of Marlowe's death, "their versification and tone," "their internal contents":

I. "A Poem, essentially a work of art": 1-20, *P. P.* VIII, 53-55

II. Poetical Epistles: 100-108, 59, 60, 25, 26 (Epistle I); 29-32 (Epistle II); 109-112, 121 (Epistle III); 36-39 (Epistle IV); 50-52, 48 (Epistle V); 76, 78-80, 82-87 (Epistle VI); 49, 88-93 (Epistle VII); 67-70, 126, 77 (Epistle VIII)

III. Poetical Epistles: 33-35, 40-42 (Epistle I); 94-96 (Epistle II); 62-66, 81 (Epistle III); 71-74 (Epistle IV); 116-120 (Epistle V); 122-125 (Epistle VI)

IV. Sonnets to a Lady: 21-24, 27, 28, 61, 43-47, 75, 56-58, 97-99, 113-115, 153, 154, 128, 145, 130, 127, 131, 132, 135, 136, 143, 139, 140, 149, 137, 138, 141, 142, 147, 148, 150-152, 144, 133, 134, 129, 146

Second, the startling news that *Antony and Cleopatra* is (pp. 21-31) a "Reply to the tale in the Sonnets" with a distinguished cast, including the Sh. "of 1593—an archangel ruined" as Antony, "the good Shakspeare" as Caesar, the dark woman as Cleopatra, "Mrs. W. Shakspeare" as Octavia, Southampton as Enobarbus, Pembroke as Sextus Pompeius, Marlowe as Lepidus, and, for a climax, Thomas Thorpe as Menas.

Such a flight of fancy as Cartwright's might well have discouraged attempts at bettering Menas's grouping. It did not. Instead it probably suggested to the German translator BODENSTEDT (1862) his own four-part classification, which—ignoring Tieck and "Dr. D."—he claims (p. 214) is "the first attempt in Germany to establish the poetic sequence of the sonnets in order to heighten the reader's pleasure."

I. *P. P.* III, 128, *P. P.* VIII, 135, 136, 143, 23, 121, 153, 154, 152, 137, 151, 145, 149, 150, 141, 142, 75, 147, 148, 130, 127, 132, 131, 138, 46, 47, 113, 114, 57, 97-99, 56, 96, 95, 88, 87, 89, 139, 140, 129

II. 133, 134, 144, 33-35, 40-42, 26, 20, 24, 29-31, 36, 66, 39, 38, 48, 52, 50, 51, 27, 28, 61, 43-45, 53, 80, 82, 85, 86, 78, 79, 37, 58, 49, 62, 83, 70, 69, 67, 68, 93, 81, 71, 74, 32

III. 1-19, 22, 21, 126, 110-112, 84, 64, 65, 107, 108

IV. 100, 109, 118, 90, 92, 125, 119, 120, 117, 103, 63, 104-106, 122, 115, 116, 73, 72, 91, 76, 101, 102, 59, 60, 54, 55, 123, 94, 146, 124, 77, 25

At the end of his edition (p. 190) Bodenstedt apologized because, "through an oversight of the copyist, observed too late, several of the sonnets are not in their proper places. Fortunately the error is conspicuous only in the case of . . . [84]; for the others it is scarcely noticeable." In his 1866 translation he presumably corrected the mistaken order, to produce the following scheme:

I. *P. P.* III, 128, *P. P.* VIII, 135, 136, 143, 23, 121, 153, 154, 152, 137, 151, 145, 149, 150, 141, 142, 75, 147, 148, 130, 127, 132, 131, 138, 46, 47, 113, 114, 57, 58, 97-99, 56, 96, 95, 88-90, 139, 140, 129

II. 133, 134, 144, 33-35, 40-42, 26, 20, 24, 29-31, 36, 66, 38, 39, 48, 52, 50, 51, 27, 28, 61, 43-45, 53, 80, 82, 83, 85-87, 76, 78, 79, 37, 49, 69, 70, 67, 68, 93, 81, 71-74, 32

III. 1-19, 22, 21, 126, 109-112, 84, 64, 65, 107, 108

IV. 100, 101, 117-120, 103, 62, 63, 104-106, 122, 115, 116, 123-125, 91, 92, 102, 59, 60, 54, 55, 94, 146, 77, 25

This 1866 revision was in turn adopted for the Dutch translation of *BURGERS-DIJK*, Utrecht, 1879.

In the meantime PALGRAVE (ed. 1865, p. 241) had called "Thorpe's arrangement . . . of the same uncertain authenticity as the other circumstances of the publication," but had made no changes. WHITE's opinion (ed. 1865, p. 149) was that "excepting the first seventeen . . . continuity of purpose is rarely traceable through more than half a dozen of them in the order . . . [of Q]. In my opinion they were printed in the first edition much in the sequence in which they were gathered together, with little attention to systematic arrangement; and the consequence is a distracting, and, most probably, a remediless confusion after the twenty-second sonnet, even as to those which have manifestly some connection with each other."

In the next year the poet MASSEY (ed. 1866) wrote what might well be called a romantic novel, illuminating the secret history of the sonnets, which he divided into "personal" and "dramatic," the latter expressing alleged sentiments of Elizabeth Vernon, Southampton, Pembroke, and others. As fiction, his book is passable reading, but it is made out of whole cloth. His classification is as follows:

I. Shakspeare to the Earl [of Southampton], Wishing Him to Marry: 26, 1-17

II. Shakspeare to the Earl, in Praise of His Personal Beauty: 25, 20, 59, 106, 18, 62, 22, 53, 54

III. Shakspeare to the Earl, Promising Immortality: 23, 19, 60, 64, 65, 55

- IV. Shakspeare to the Earl, Chiefly Concerning a Rival Poet . . . Marlowe: 78-80, 86, 85, 21, 83, 84, 82, 32
- V. Shakspeare is about to Write on the Courtship of . . . Southampton, According to the Earl's Suggestion: 38
- VI. Southampton in Love with Elizabeth Vernon: 29-31, 37
- VII. Shakspeare to the Earl, When He Has Known Him Some Three Years: 104, 126
- VIII. Shakspeare Proposes to Write of the Earl in His Absence Abroad: 39
- IX. The Earl to Mistress Vernon on and in His Absence Abroad: 36, 50, 51, 113, 114, 27, 28, 43, 61, 48, 44, 45, 52
- X. Shakspeare of the Earl in His Absence: 24, 46, 47
- XI. Elizabeth Vernon's Jealousy of Her Lover . . . and Her Friend, Lady Rich: 144, 33-35, 41, 42, 133, 134, 40
- XII. Shakspeare on the Slander: 70
- XIII. The Earl to Elizabeth Vernon after the Jealousy: 56, 75
- XIV. Elizabeth Vernon Repays the Earl by a Flirtation of Her Own: His Reproach: 49, 88, 91-93, 95
- XV. Shakspeare is Sad for the Earl's "*Harmful Deeds*": 66-69, 94, 77
- XVI. A Farewell of the Earl's to Elizabeth Vernon: 87, 89, 90
- XVII. The Earl to Elizabeth Vernon after His Absence: 97-99
- XVIII. Shakspeare to the Earl after Some Time of Silence: 100-103, 76, 108, 105
- XIX. The Earl to Elizabeth Vernon—Their Final Reconciliation: with Shakspeare's Sonnet on Their Marriage: 109-112, 121, 117-120, 116
- XX. Shakspeare to the Earl, Chiefly on His Own Death: 71-74, 63, 81
- XXI. Southampton, in the Tower, to His Countess: 123-125; Shakspeare to the Earl in Prison: 115; and upon His Release: 107
- XXII. The Earl to Elizabeth Vernon on Parting with a Book Which She Had Given to Him: 122
- XXIII. "Apprentice work" by William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke: 145
- XXIV. William Herbert's Passion for Lady Rich: 127, 132, 128, 138, 130, 131, 96, 135, 136, 142, 143, 57, 58, 139, 140, 149, 137, 148, 141, 150, 147, 152, 151, 129, 146
- XXV. Appendix: Two Odd Sonnets: 153, 154

In 1872 MASSEY's book was reissued under the title, *The Secret Drama of Sh.'s Sonnets Unfolded, with the Characters Identified*, with a "Supplemental Chapter" defending his scheme. But tinkering with the sonnets often gives one a fatal urge to retinker, and the fact that tinkers are usually not satisfied with their own mending helps destroy one's respect for the jobs they turn out. So while Massey had flatly announced (p. 436) that his allocation of the sonnets "ignores no difficulty, violates no fact," yet in his 1888 edition he revamped it as follows:

I

- A. [Sh. to Southampton, commending marriage]: 1-13
- B. [Sh. to Southampton, commending marriage and promising immortality]: 14-26
- C. [Sh. to Southampton—prologue to the "dramatic sonnets"]: 38

- D. [Southampton finds comfort in thoughts of Elizabeth Vernon]: 29-31
- E. [Sh. to Southampton]: 32
- F. [Vernon to Southampton on her jealousy of Lady Rich]: 33-35, 41, 42
- G. [Vernon to Lady Rich]: 133, 134, 40
- H. [Vernon's soliloquy]: 144
- I. [Sh. to Southampton on the latter's departure from England]: 39
- J. [Southampton to Vernon from his departure until his return]: 36, 37, 27, 28, 43, 61, 44-52, 56
- K. [Sh. to Southampton on faithfulness in love]: 53-55, 59, 60, 62-65
- L. [Vernon lamenting Southampton's reckless course]: 66-69
- M. [Sh. in Southampton's defense]: 70
- N. [Sh. to Southampton in contemplation of death]: 71-74, 76, 77
- O. [Sh. to Southampton on Marlowe and other rivals]: 78-86
- P. [Southampton to Vernon anticipating a parting]: 87-93
- Q. [Vernon to Southampton "on his ill deeds"]: 94-96
- R. [Southampton to Vernon after a separation]: 97-99
- S. [Sh. to Southampton after a silence]: 100-106, 108
- T. [Southampton to Vernon—their reconciliation]: 109-114, 117-122
- U. [Sh. on Southampton's marriage]: 116
- V. [Southampton in the Tower]: 123-125
- W. [Sh. to Southampton in prison and on his release]: 115, 107
- X. [An unfinished, misplaced poem]: 126

II

Dramatic Sonnets Composed for Master Will. Herbert: 127-132, 135-143, 57, 58, 145-154

BELL (*Fortnightly*, 1866, V, 735) sensibly criticized Massey's first scheme: "It is a manifest perversion of the evidence to break up the order of the poems into fresh combinations, and then to argue upon the imaginary results thus obtained. By a similar process, any theory, however absurd, might be made to acquire a certain illusory colouring of probability." GELBCKE (*Sh.'s Sonette*, 1867), however, accepted every detail of Massey's analysis. KRAUSS (*Sh.'s Southampton-Sonette*, 1872; *Sh.'s Selbstbekenntnisse*, 1882), too, approved of it; but, though in his first book (p. 7) he says, "my order is substantially that of Massey," actually it turns out to differ somewhat in detail:

26, 1-17, 20, 59, 106, 62, 22, 53, 54, 23, 18, 19, 60, 64, 65, 55, 78-80, 86, 85, 21, 83, 84, 82, 32, 38, 24, 46, 47, 29-31, 37, 25, 36, 50, 51, 113, 114, 27, 28, 43, 61, 48, 44, 45, 52, 104, 39, 144, 33-35, 41, 42, 133, 134, 40, 70, 121, 56, 75, 49, 88, 91-93, 69, 94-96, 67, 68, 77, 66, 87, 89, 90, 97-103, 76, 108, 105, 109-112, 117-120, 116, 71-74, 63, 81, 123-125, 115, 107, 122, 128(?),¹ 126, 57, 58, 127, 132, 135, 136, 142, 143, 138, 152, 147, 139, 141, 150, 149, 131, 137, 148, 130, 140, 145, 151, 129, 146, 153, 154

¹ Krauss believed (1882, p. 229 n.) that 128 may belong either among the Southampton sonnets or among the dark-woman sonnets. As he assigned it no definite position, I have placed it at the end of the Southampton group.

The Spanish translator D. MATÍAS DE VELASCO Y ROJAS, MARQUÉS DE DOS HERMANAS (Sh.'s *Obras*, 1877, I, 217-299, 467 f.) also knew Massey, but he preferred to make a reshuffling all his own and to believe in a biographical, not a dramatic, theory. He divided the sonnets into nine groups, which apparently tell something about the lives of Sh. and Southampton. Group IX, for example, deals with Southampton's imprisonment in 1601 and his release in 1603. The first sonnet in each group is a sort of introduction to the lyrics that follow.

- I. 25, 20, 106, 53, 54, 59, 62
- II. 135, 136, 143, 145, 128, 139, 140, 127, 131, 132, 130, 21, 149, 137, 138, 147, 148, 141, 150, 142, 152, 151, 129, 133, 144, 134, 33-35, 40-42, 153, 154
- III. 26, 1-17, 104
- IV. 23, 19, 60, 64, 65, 63, 55, 18
- V. 78-80, 86, 85, 84, 82, 83
- VI. 38, 29-31, 36, 50, 51, 113, 114, 27, 28, 43, 61, 48, 44, 45, 52, 75, 56, 87, 89, 90, 97-99, 109-112, 121, 117-120
- VII. 49, 88, 91-93, 122, 66-69, 94, 96, 95, 77, 126, 39, 24, 46, 47, 58, 70, 57, 116
- VIII. 100-103, 76, 32, 37, 105, 108, 22, 71, 73, 72, 74, 81
- IX. 123-125, 115, 107, 146

New evidence was presented by GOEDEKE (*Deutsche Rundschau*, 1877, X, 386-398) to prove that Q is made up of a collection of miscellaneous lyrics, written at different times, addressed to various people, and distributed on no ascertainable plan. To bring order out of chaos he studied for the first time the use of the pronouns *thou* and *you*—with surprising results. In 1-126 (p. 398) he found seventy-three "thou-sonnets," thirty "you-sonnets," and twenty-three lacking either pronoun. For unexplained reasons he added eleven of these latter to the "thou" group and twelve to the "you" group, so that his total rose to eighty-four "thou-sonnets," forty-two "you-sonnets." The third group consists of 127-154. As fourteen is the largest common denominator of all three groups, Goedeke—by a process of reasoning unknown to logicians but common among scholars—decided that Sh. wrote his sonnets in groups of fourteen, and that he planned fourteen such groups (one hundred ninety-six sonnets) instead of the eleven (one hundred fifty-four sonnets) that survive. But DOWDEN (ed. 1881), using the same evidence, interpreted it in a totally different way (pp. 79 f., above).

In 1881 (*E. S.*, IV, 1-24) STENGEL detected no unifying principle in Q but, instead, a disorder of ideas and an "illogical alternation" of *thou* and *you*. But rearrangements based, like Massey's, on personal interpretation and manufactured hypotheses did not appeal to him. He changed 1-126 around so as to give them "a continuous chain of thought":

- 26, 1, 4, 8, 7, 11, 3, 5, 6, 2, 9, 10, 12, 20, 14, 13, 15-17, 59, 106, 53, 105, 54, 104, 81, 55, 64, 19, 63, 65, 60, 107, 18, 126, 108, 77, 122, 100, 101, 38, 23, 73, 74, 32, 39, 78, 79, 82, 21, 76, 103, 83, 85, 80, 86, 71, 72, 102, 84, 58, 57, 67, 68, 123, 66, 116, 115, 124, 25, 29-31, 37, 125, 91-94, 69, 70, 33-35, 95, 96, 40-42, 36, 87, 50, 51, 27, 28, 43, 61, 62, 22, 24, 46, 47, 44, 45, 97-99, 48, 49, 88-90, 109, 117, 110, 121, 111, 112, 75, 52, 113, 114, 118-120, 56

Then CONRAD (*Jahrbuch*, 1884, XIX, 184-264), to support his discovery that the friend was Essex and the date of the first sonnets around 1589, reordered them in groups on the basis of stylistic peculiarities and the interrelationship between sonnets and sonnet-groups. His "conclusive evidence" resulted in details too confused and contradictory to be here reproduced. As a mere specimen, he puts 1-17, 20, 26, 59, 106, 145, and various others in the year 1589 and 25, 116, 123-125 in 1600-1601.

To MACKAY (*Nineteenth Century*, 1884, XVI, 242-262) it was "evident that Mr. W. H. . . . exercised but little care in the arrangement and classification of the treasures which he was the means of presenting to the world; that he was not solicitous, and certainly not successful, in separating the poems into groups according to their subjects, or with due regard to the sequence and continuity of the ideas expressed in them, and that his collection [Q] is a confused and heterogeneous mass of fortuitous atoms." Calling his essay—with no justification—"A Tangled Skein Unravelling," Mackay divided the sonnets into six groups, though some are not mentioned and others are listed twice:

I. Addressed to a rich, noble, and handsome young man [probably Pembroke]: 1-20, 53-55

II. Addressed by a poet, whose name is *William*, to the dark-haired, dark-eyed wife of another *William*: 34-36, 127-144, 151, 152. (All are by William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, about the supposititious wife of William Cavendish, Earl of Devonshire.)

III. A vindication of the poet's character to a powerful friend and generous patron: 30, 37, 38, 40, 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, 89-91, 110-113. (All are by Marlowe.)

IV. Love sonnets, addressed to one or many women, by one or many lovers, not connected in any way with the loves of the two Williams: 49, 57, 58, 62-69, 71-74, 104-107, 113 [*sic*], 114, 118-122, 128, 140-142. (All these are dramatic sonnets describing "under a thin veil the ambitious love of Leicester for Elizabeth." They form "as complete a dramatic poem as *Venus . . . or Lucrece*.")

V. Miscellaneous sonnets . . . addressed to various persons. (He mentions "stray sonnets," but cites only 30, 33, 44, 130, 145, the last certainly not Sh.'s.)

VI. Sublime or self-confident assertions of the enduring fame of the poet and predictions of the immortality of his productions. (81 is the only previously unclassified sonnet mentioned; the others are 18, 19, 55.)

Next, COPIN translated *Les Sonnets de Sh.*, 1888, in an order heavily dependent upon Hugo's, dividing them as follows:

I. Love: 135, 136, 143, 145, 128, *P. P.* VIII, 139, 140, 127, 131, 132, 130, 21, 149, 137, 138, 147, 148, 141, 150, 142, 152-154, 151, 129, 133, 134, 144, 33-35, 40-42

II. Friendship: 26, 23, 25, 20, 24, 46, 47, 31, 94-96, 69, 67, 68, 70, 91-93, 57, 58, 77-79, 38, 80, 82-87, 76, 106, 59, 100-105

III. Separation: 39, 50, 51, 113-117, 75, 56, 27, 28, 61, 43-45, 97-99, 53, 48, 52, 118-120, 109, 110

IV. Misanthropy: 66, 71, 72, 49, 88-90, 73, 37, 62, 22, 29, 30, 111, 112, 121, 36

V. Posterity: 1-15, 126, 16, 17

VI. Immortality: 81, 122-125, 18, 19, 63, 32, 146, 74, 64, 65, 54, 55, 60, 108, 107

In 1892 (*G. M.*, CCLXXII, 77-82) SHINDLER suggested the probability that only a small number of the sonnets written by Sh. have survived, and that many of those in Q are not by him. Several, he avers, do not belong to the two main series: 26 and 116 can refer neither to the friend nor to the dark woman, 129 and 146 are addressed to no person at all. The disorder in Q "is not absolute chaos; there are signs of continuity, there are numbers which clearly stand together, but the breaks and gaps, the omissions and the wrong arrangements, are just as clear. . . . Thorpe . . . could only print the Sonnets just as they stood on his MS. Those that, either in books or on sheets of paper, stood together he printed together, and so produced those traces of orderly arrangement which we see." 126 "might have come earlier without any inappropriateness." In 1-126 there may be sonnets addressed to the dark woman. 33-35 and 40-42 "form a closely connected sequence, but are separated by Sonnets entirely irrelevant." In the second series, 127-152, "the traces of order are fewer and we have almost utter chaos." Thus "143, 144 are plainly anterior to the sequence 133-135." It is a considerable relief to find Shindler saying that, although he cannot accept the Q order as authentic, he does not find it incumbent on him to propose a new one. Thorpe's collection was stolen, surreptitious, incomplete, "and because it was incomplete, we cannot do much to mend its defects of arrangement."

The German translation of the highly imaginative VON MAUNTZ, 1894, shows the influence of Massey, as in the statements that Elizabeth Vernon is supposed to speak 33-35 in 1595 and 40, 133, 134 in 1599, and her lover—later her husband—Southampton, 36 in 1595, 97-99 in 1598, and 123 and 125 in 1600-1601. Von Mauntz's new order,¹ which seems to me to have little interest and no value, runs thus:

I. 128, three sonnets from *Love's Labor's Lost* and the *P. P.*, 145, 135, 136, 57, 58, 127, 138, 149, 132, 131, 151, 150, 148, 142, 141, 130, 139, 152, 147, 140, 137, 144, 41, 42, 143, 129, 146. (All are poems referring to a woman.)

II. 1-17, 23, 26, 20, 59, 106, 22, 62, 53, 39, 126, 68, 64, 21, 103, 76, 108, 105, 38, 78-80, 86, 85, 83, 84, 82, 77, 70, 67, 69, 94-96, 104, 49, the *P. & T.*, 56, 29, 116, 100, 102, 32, 73, 71, 72, 74, 101, 54, 18, 19, 60, 65, 55, 63, 81, 115, 124, 107, 122, 33-36, 97-99, 40, 133, 134, 123, 125. (All refer to a man.)

III. 24, 46, 47, 25, 30, 31, 37, 52, 50, 51, 113, 114, 27, 28, 43, 61, 48, 44, 45, 87-93, 109-112, 117-120, 75, 121, 66, 153, 154

About 1895 MASSON (*Sh. Personally*, 1914, p. 197) published his theory (see p. 77, above) that there were "eight papers of Sonnets, really connected, but written at intervals over a series of years." The papers were "not indicated by breaks at the proper points when they were printed, but, with that omission, arranged there exactly in their right order, save that the last twenty-six (Sonnets 127-152) ought to be intercalated bodily between Sonnets 32 and

¹ It is slightly different from that he gave in the *Jahrbuch*, 1893, XXVIII, 329 f.

33." LEE (*Life*, 1898, pp. 96 f.) had still less confidence in Q: "It is unlikely that the order in which the poems were printed follows the order in which they were written. Fantastic endeavours have been made to detect in the original arrangement of the poems a closely connected narrative, but the thread is on any showing constantly interrupted." Even the usual division of 1-126 to the friend, 127-154 to the dark woman "cannot be literally justified." Almost all other Elizabethan sonnets, like Sh.'s, "are pitched in what sounds superficially to be the same key of pleading or yearning. Thus almost every collection gives at a first perusal a specious and delusive impression of homogeneity." These opinions LEE repeated in all subsequent editions of the *Life* (as 1915, pp. 165 f.). Sh.'s hand seemed to him totally absent. Instead (ed. 1905, p. 41), "the compiler" was the person who "arranged the poems roughly in order of subject."

On the contrary, BUTLER (ed. 1899, p. 2) writes that Q has, with a few exceptions, "preserved the order in which the Sonnets were written." If it had not, they "would have been a riddle beyond all reading." Of the first series 1-125 (p. 67) only 35 and 121 "have got misplaced," but of 126-154 "some are obviously misplaced, while others are irrelevant to the series." But is it not an unwarranted assumption that Sh. intended every sonnet to be "relevant"? He could hardly have guaranteed that each would fit the theories of commentators some three centuries after his death. Butler (pp. 17 f.) says that of the last twenty-eight sonnets only nine (127, 128, 132-134, 139, 140, 142, 143) are actually addressed by Sh. to a woman; of the others, some are addressed to Mr. W. H., some "were written for Mr W. H. to give to Shakespeare's mistress as though he had written them himself," and some are addressed to no one—assumptions incapable of proof. His redistribution, however, is conservative, demanding far fewer changes than most other schemes. It runs:

1-32, 121, 33, 34, 36-39, 127, 128, 130-132, 137-144, 135, 136, 151, 35, 40-42, 134, 133, 152, 43-118, 147-150, 119, 120, 122-125, 126 (Appendix A), 129 (Appendix B), 145 (Appendix C), 146 (Appendix D), 153 (Appendix E), 154 (Appendix F)

Much more drastic was GODWIN (ed. 1900), who admitted (pp. 17-20) that in Q "groups of sonnets show themselves everywhere," but with gaps between them. Probably when Sh. "wrote the sonnets in his table books he numbered them in the order in which they were written, without reference to their connections of theme; and afterwards, when he copied them or allowed them to be copied for circulation among his friends, he adhered to the same desultory arrangement." The old American scattered the sonnets among six classes, the first of which consists only of 77, and by a choice process of reasoning exclaimed (p. 58): "Dividing 154 by 2 we get 77, which is, strange to say, the number of this [central] sonnet." Passing strange indeed. Godwin's classification may be tabulated thus:

- I. The Central and Explanatory Sonnet: 77
- II. The Independents or Solitaries: 145, 126, 153, 154, 19, 122, 81, 63, 26
- III. A Plea for Creative or Poetic Art: 12, 1, 4, 10, 3, 5, 6, 2, 11, 9, 13, 7, 8, 15-17, 14

IV. A Young Love-Time: 25, 21, 130, 18, 104, 22, 32, 50, 51, 27, 28, 44-47, 52, 30, 31, 48, 116, 115, 137, 54, 69, 70, 121, 94, 66-68, 73, 71, 72, 74, 97-99, 29

V. The Episode of the Dark Lady: 23, 127, 131, 132, 24, 141, 140, 149, 138, 128, 136, 135, 142, 139, 61, 58, 143, 57, 134, 133, 41, 40, 42, 35, 151, 150, 147, 148, 144, 146, 95, 96, 120, 152, 87, 109, 119, 129

VI. The Poet's Communion with the Higher Muses: 38, 43, 113, 114, 53, 20, 106, 59, 75, 64, 65, 60, 62, 103, 39, 37, 36, 76, 78, 79, 82-85, 80, 86, 49, 88-93, 33, 34, 56, 100-102, 110-112, 117, 118, 107, 108, 123-125, 105, 55

Whatever may be the merits or demerits of Godwin's regrouping, his book is a *tour de force* for a man of eighty-four, who would hardly have been expected to show interest in Sh.'s subjects.

SECCOMBE and ALLEN (*Age of Sh.*, 1903, I, 25) had little confidence in the sequence followed by Thorpe: it "involved a rough, and, to all appearance, a careless division of the sonnets into groups, according to apparent subject. As Shakespeare made no protest against the publication, and did not issue any corrected edition, it is a good inference that he did not positively object to the order which Thorpe gave to the sonnets; an inference that he approved of that order would obviously be unjustified. There is no evidence that Thorpe's order corresponds with anything in the actual chronology of the sonnets, or that the sonnets of each group formed by him were addressed to the same person." But, of course, evidence to show that Sh., "made no protest against the publication" is entirely lacking.

WOLFF (*Sh.'s Sonnet*, 1903, p. xii) "can see in the sonnets only detached lyric poems which originated according to the season or the poet's mood," and which the publisher rearranged. "All attempts to bring the sonnets into a better and more systematic order," he wrote elsewhere (*William Sh.*, 1903, p. 39) "must fail, since it is impossible to see in them any sort of complete and logically progressive plot." Again in 1907 (*Shakespeare*, I, 289) and in 1916 (*E. S.*, L, 156) he repeated these comments, stressing the point that any order is artificial, and that the sequence in Q tells a story only because the publisher arranged the sonnets with a story in mind. In contrast to that opinion COURTHOPE (*History*, 1903, IV, 40) suggests that the 1609 arrangement was one adopted by Sh. "to baffle the curiosity of the reading public."

BEECHING (ed. 1904, p. lxiii) believed with Dowden that 1-126 are written to a youth, but called 127-154 "an appendix, being addressed to, or written about, the woman who figures so ill-omenedly in the main series." But to Dowden's theory that Q represents Sh.'s own intention, and that nearly every sonnet is, in one way or another, connected with its neighbor, he could not subscribe. It is useless (p. lxv n.) to call on the personal pronouns to corroborate such a theory: "In the sonnets about the Rival Poet, which undoubtedly form a series, sometimes *thou* is used and sometimes *you*. And in face of the fact that 97 and 98, which are almost identical in sense, employ different pronouns, it is impossible to discriminate between them as to the degree of affection they imply." Q offers various puzzles (pp. lxiv-lxvi). For instance, "Sonnet 70 indubitably follows 69; but it is, on the surface, as inconsistent with it as with the group 33-35." But the fact that some of 127-152 "throw light on" 1-126 "confirms the theory that the sonnets do form a sequence and are not a mere

bookseller's haphazard collection." The printer's error of *their* for *thy* occurs fourteen times from 26 to 70 and only once elsewhere—in 128. A change in compositors cannot be the explanation. But since 26 apparently opens a new group, as 71 certainly does, it looks "as if the printer had used for this division of the sonnets a separate manuscript, less plainly written than those he had before him for the rest, and so it becomes almost certain that—at any rate for this section—the order . . . was fixed when it came into Thorpe's hands. Sonnet 128 may very well have been included in the same manuscript," though it was "relegated to the appendix as referring to the poet's mistress." Probably a few sonnets in 1-126 are misplaced: 36-39 "do not explain their position; 75 would come better after 52; 77 and 81 interrupt the series on the Rival Poet," while 97-99 are out of tone with what precedes and follows. "In the main, however, the order justifies itself to an attentive reader." 127-154, an appendix, "are largely concerned with an incident already handled in the earlier part of the first series, only from another point of view." Perhaps "all the sonnets not addressed to the friend had been thrown together without arrangement at the end of the series with other occasional sonnets." 153, 154 are irrelevant, and 146 "must be the Envoy." BEECHING summarized his views in Bullen's edition of 1907 (p. 371): the order of 1-126 is approximately correct, but "36-39 do not explain their position, 75 would come better after 52, 77 and 81 interrupt the series on the rival poets, and 97-99 have no connexion with what precedes or follows. . . . [127-154] in the appendix do not form a connected series."

STOPES (ed. 1904) reprinted Q, but in an appendix suggested a thoroughgoing rearrangement which divides the sonnets into twenty-seven sequences, a division that, so far as can be seen, appealed to nobody but herself. "Some of the Sequences," she explained (p. 157), "are determined by catch-words, or in others by what may be called catch-ideas, linking one sonnet to another. But in some we find phrases and ideas, apparently intended to be further worked out, and in others there are opening phrases, that had evidently depended originally on some other verse." Disarmingly enough, she described her work as only "tentative." It does not pretend "to *better Shakespeare*, but to *find out what he means*, and to *get behind Thomas Thorpe*." Readers seeking light on Sh.'s meaning may judge for themselves how well Stopes succeeds:

- I. Poetical Experiments: 153, 154
- II. Urging the Youth to marry at the request of some one: 1-7, 12, 11
- III. Personal affection develops. The Youth an inspiration: 8-10, 13-19, 24, 20, 21, 25, 22
- IV. Complimentary Badinage: 127, 132, 128, 149, 145, 138, 130
- V. The Poet sends Manuscripts: 23, 26
- VI. Feels the comfort of his Friend's love: 29, 112, 30-32
- VII. Temptations: 148, 141, 131, 140, 139, 150
- VIII. Departure: 50, 51, 44-47
- IX. Travel: 27, 28
- X. After return sees the Lady: 136, 151, 152, 142, 143, 135
- XI. Hears that his own particular Friend superseded him: 33, 34, 41, 40, 42, 35

- XII. Reproaches the Lady for causing a double pain: 133, 134
- XIII. Love's unreasonable Fever: 137, 147, 144
- XIV. The Poet's Meditations: 146, 129
- XV. The Poet's gift to reconciled Friend: 77
- XVI. Beauty and the power of Time: 62, 63, 60, 64, 65, 55
- XVII. Rumours concerning Rivals: 75, 48, 49, 88-90, 121, 36, 91-93
- XVIII. The Rivals: 76, 78-80, 82-87
- XIX. Healing of the Breach: 57, 58, 43, 61, 56
- XX. Shewing he feels old and weary: 73, 74, 71, 72, 81
- XXI. Absence, which gives pain: 97-99, 53
- XXII. The Friend is coming of age (1594)? : 104-106, 59
- XXIII. Gossip concerning Friend: 66-68, 54, 94, 69, 95, 96, 70
- XXIV. The Poet forgets to sing: 100, 103, 101, 102, 52, 39, 37, 38, 108
- XXV. Clears himself from charge of faithlessness: 122, 109-111, 117, 118, 113, 114, 119, 120
- XXVI. Triumph of Love over Time: 115, 116, 123, 107, 124, 125
- XXVII. Time's control of Nature: 126

By 1905 ROLFE had turned his back on Dowden. Now (ed. 1905, pp. 22-26) he is far from sure that all of 1-126 are addressed to a man. "Moreover, certain sonnets . . . appear to be out of place, though many of the editors attempt to prove that the order of the series is Shakespeare's own. But if the 70th Sonnet is addressed to the same person as 33-35 (to say nothing of 40-42) it seems to be clearly out of place." Adapting the language of GOLLANCZ (ed. 1896, p. vi), he adds: "One broken link spoils the chain; if the order of the poems is wrong here, it may be so elsewhere." These were also the sentiments of O. ELTON (*Modern Studies*, 1907, pp. 60 f.) and of WALSH (ed. 1908, pp. 21 f.). "There is good cause," said Elton, "to think that 100-26 all refer to a season of reconciliation between the poet and his friend, both of whom have in diverse ways offended. If so, it is natural to read the series addressed to the dark woman, 127-52, before the series 100-26; and this great displacement is only one of the arguments for rearranging the *Sonnets* much more freely than has hitherto [*sic*] been orthodox." Walsh could find nothing in 1-126 "to show that they all refer to one man, or even to men, and it is highly improbable that they were all addressed to the same person," but 127-154 are "addressed to a woman." Thorpe's order (pp. 31 f.) is "worthless. It is neither chronological nor according to subjects." To atone for these deficiencies Walsh (pp. 35, 37) shuffled the sonnets around, "according to their subjects," "so that they flow one from another with the fewest breaks and mutually interpret one another." He has eight sections:¹

I. Early Miscellaneous Sonnets: 145; 154, 153 (with sonnets from the plays and the *P. P.*)

II. To His Fair Effeminate Friend, in Whom Beauty is Embodied: 20, 53, 59, 106; 67, 68; 54; 18, 19, 60, 63, 64 and 65 (one poem), 15; 16, 17, 1, 7, 14, 12, 11, 8, 3, 2, 9 and 10 (one poem), 13, 4, 5 and 6 (one poem)

¹ Walsh omits 126 (printing it in his notes, p. 262, as a "madrigal" like 104), a fact to be remembered when consulting the table below.

III. To His Dark Disdainful Mistress, Who Makes Foul Fair: 21, 130; 127, 132; 131; 24, 46, 47; 128; 136

IV. On His Loves: 50, 51; 27, 28, 61; 48, 52, 75; 44 and 45 (one poem); 97, 43; 113 and 114 (one poem); 98, 99; 57, 58; 33, 34; 120, 118, 111, 112, 109, 117, 110, 119; 29, 25, 22, 37; 62, 39, 36; 71-74, 81; 91, 49, 88-90, 92

V. Episode of the Dark Mistress Wooing the Fair Friend: 144, 133, 134, 40-42, 35; 143, 135; 138, 151; 139, 140, 93, 142, 94-96, 69; 137, 148-150, 141, 147, 152

VI. Resumption of the Theme of Eternising the Fair Friend, and on the Constancy of the Poet's Love, in Spite of the Decay of Beauty: 100-102, 56, 105, 108, 104, 124, 125, 123, 115, 116, 107, 55

VII. Sonnets Addressed to his Patron: 26, 38; 23, 103; 76, 78, 79, 84, 82, 83, 86, 80, 85, 32

VIII. Late Miscellaneous Sonnets: 77, 122, 70, 87; 129; 121, 146, 66; 30, 31

In Walsh's favor it may be noted that he does not change the sonnets about to make them fit some theory or narrative. Of his work H. D. GRAY (*P. M. L. A.*, 1915, XXX, 635 n.) comments: "Walsh considers each sonnet as a law unto itself, and he breaks up the obvious sequences rather needlessly. Still, one who came to the Sonnets for the first time in his edition would, I think, gain a truer impression of their meaning and their value than he would from the Quarto arrangement." And with the last sentence ALDEN (ed. 1916, p. 427) concurs. Without concurring too heartily, one may point out that WALSH (p. 32) has made a telling comparison; namely, that "Thorpe's arrangement of the sonnets is of no more help to our understanding of their development than is the Folio-editors' arrangement of the plays."

In *The Sonnets of William Sh.*, 1913, DE CHAMBRUN uttered her considered judgment (p. vi) that "every lover and student of these poems has as good a right to change the order in which they are printed as their first pirate-publisher, even a better right." As a matter of abstract justice no doubt the right does exist, but one cannot refrain from a desire to invoke Sh.'s epitaph. Some impression of the value of the countess's own work may be gained from her admission (p. 115) that she has "retained Thorpe's idea of *separate series*, dividing, as he does, the sonnets according to their inspirers." In other words, she thinks that the PRAETORIUS facsimile of 1886, in the margins of which TYLER caused to be printed poem and line numbers as well as "Series II" before 127 and "Series III" before 153, reproduces exactly Thorpe's quarto of 1609. These "facts" (first published by her in the *North American Review*, 1913, CXCVIII, 132 f.), she claims wrongly (p. 15), have "never been referred to by any commentator,"¹ whereupon she reproduces a page from the facsimile in the belief that it comes from the original Q.² Even Homer nods, and it is

¹ They *had* been referred to by VON MAUNTZ (Sh.'s *Gedichte*, 1894, p. 153), who, like De Chambrun, confused the Praetorius facsimile with Q.

² She does the same thing again in her *Giovanni Florio*, 1921, pp. 115 f. n., although her error had been pointed out by M. FÖRSTER (*Jahrbuch*, 1914, L, 182) and by ALDEN (*J. E. G. P.*, 1915, XIV, 459). De Chambrun converted GARNIER (Sh.'s *Sonnets*, 1922, pp. xiii f.), who repeats her misinformation and calls her rearrangement "judicieux et discret."

only just to De Chambrun to say that her reclassification for amateurs (which she more or less repeats in *Sh. Actor-Poet*, 1922) is—despite WOLFF's strictures (*E. S.*, 1916, L, 156 f.)—scarcely less valuable than that of most of her predecessors in numerical juggling. The composed wonder of her framework follows:

I. *To Southampton*

- A. 1-20, 26
- B. 39, 62, 75, 22, 73, 74, 59, 53, 106, 68, 126, 37, 91, 48, 54, 105, 25, 52, 29-31, 71, 49, 88-90, 72, 92, 93
- C. 23, 103, 38, 32, 82, 83, 21, 78, 79, 84, 85, 81, 76, 80, 86, 77
- D. 113, 43-45, 24, 46, 47, 50, 51, 27, 28, 66, 61, 97-99
- E. 56, 118, 119, 114, 57, 58, 69, 70, 95, 96, 94, 67, 117, 110-112, 121, 33-36, 40, 87

II. *To the Dark Lady*

- A. 154, 153
- B. 132, 127, 130, 128, 135, 136, 145, 142
- C. 139, 131, 137, 147-149, 140, 141
- D. 143, 144, 41, 42, 133, 134
- E. 138, 150-152
- F. 129, 146

III. *To Southampton*

- A. 120, 100-102, 63-65, 55, 60, 115, 104, 108, 109
- B. 116
- C. 124, 125
- D. 122, 123, 107

Like the countess, H. D. GRAY (*P. M. L. A.*, 1915, XXX, 630 f.) believes that "it is not only our privilege to reconstruct the order of the Sonnets, but, if this will aid us in the appreciation of them, our duty to do so." He considers it "odd that the arrangement of . . . [Q] should ever have been taken as of any authority whatever. . . . We find sequences interrupted by Sonnets which have nothing to do with the Sonnets about them. There can be no real possibility . . . that Thorpe's collection of manuscripts could have been supplied in their proper order either by the author or by the person to whom so many of them were addressed, or by any 'only procurer.'" Thorpe arranged the sonnets, so far as he could, to make them seem to apply to W. H. (pp. 631 f.): "He began his sequence with the longest obvious series; he put as far along as possible those Sonnets which say that the poet has been silent, that three years have passed, and that the poet's friend has once wronged him; the rest Thorpe distributed, not very carefully, between these two series; and having brought them all together, he marked off this main division with the 'envoy' and added all the sonnets that he had left over." For the inconsistency in the use of italics and for the confusion of *their* and *thy* (p. 634) "neither the author nor compositor is responsible." The explanation is that "various manuscripts of sonnet groups came into Thorpe's hands, some of the manuscripts bearing characteristics not found in the others, and that Thorpe seems not to have disturbed his manuscript groups more than was necessary to remove duplicates and to put at the end sonnets which *could* not be read as concerned with Mr. W. H."

As the years move on, fewer and fewer scholars express faith in the arrangement of Q. ALDEN (ed. 1916, pp. 431-433) summarizes the arguments favoring and opposing its acceptance. In consideration of the circumstances under which they were published in 1609, "the burden of proof is on any attempt to call these sonnets a sequence in the usual meaning of the term." Evidently Q contains all the Sh. sonnets the publisher could get his hands on. Consequently they should be read as a sequence only if a sequence can be detected without reference to their background. Admitting the subjectivity that may enter into such a reading, Alden lists the sonnets which seem to him connected, and which, through contiguity, form natural groups, the four longest being 1-17, 82-86, 87-93, and 147-152. In addition, 109-125 may possibly be a single group. For the remainder, there are four groups of four sonnets, twelve trios, and twelve pairs. Alden next suggests that Thorpe began his book with the longest series of sonnets which he thought, or knew, to be connected, grouped others which seemed to him connected, and ended with those, numerically small, that he believed to have for their subject a woman. Anticipating the objection that no sonnet sequence presents a wholly consecutive story, Alden answers that no sequence is as discontinuous as are the sonnets in Q. The one certainty about them is that they are not arranged chronologically. It is highly improbable that they were ever arranged by Sh. with a view to publication, and even if it is assumed that he did, for some other purpose, arrange them in groups, the latter were dislocated by accident or chance, not preserved in Q. Personal interpretation is not a reliable guide for re-ordering the sonnets. "The only safety is in definite and substantial reasons for believing that it [the traditional order] represents the work of the author. And no such reasons have been found."

Nor could H. J. BRIDGES (*Our Fellow Sh.*, 1916, p. 276) find any "reason for supposing" the sonnets "to have been arranged by Shakespeare in the order in which Thorpe printed them. . . . Instead of one friend and one 'mistress,' they may have been addressed to half a dozen men and as many women. Several of them, in all probability, were written singly." POOLER (ed. 1918, pp. xxviii f.) thinks that 1-19 are more or less unified but that 19-25 "are hardly in sequence" and that 22 is closely connected with 24, 46, and 47. "Though there are traces . . . of a division into groups separated by envoys, yet there may be felt a difference of tone or change of atmosphere in successive sonnets within the same group." He ends his discussion with characteristic modesty (p. xxxiv): "My own impressions to which, in the absence of sufficient evidence, I attach no special importance are: that all the *Sonnets* (except perhaps cxxvii., cxlv., cliii., and cliv.)¹ were written by Shakespeare and in his own person; that Thorpe does not give them in their proper order though attempts to give a better have failed."

In 1903 ACHESON (*Sh. and the Rival Poet*, pp. 24-49) had advanced "fairly conclusive proof, that Shakespeare had no hand in their arrangement or publication." He announced his hope of publishing a rearrangement "at some future date." Again, in *Mistress Davenant*, 1913, he asserted (p. 98) that the sonnets "were not intended" by Sh. "for publication and sale," that they in-

¹ See p. 48, above.

clude poems not of his composition, and that Q was "not published with his knowledge." Acheson had "discovered" (pp. 2 f.) that they "were originally written . . . in seven *books*; each *book* containing twenty Sonnets," but the world had to wait nine further years for a complete revelation. Then, in *Sh.'s Sonnet Story*, 1922, ACHESON "demonstrated" (in some 700 pages) the supposed fact (pp. 34 f.) that Sh. wrote the majority of his sonnets to Southampton in sequences, or books, "numbering twenty sonnets to a book, and the remainder—probably in similar sequences—to Mistress Anne Davenant," but that "in Thorpe's edition the sequences are dispersed and the sonnets disarranged both sequentially and chronologically." This is the result of their having been "collected from their original recipients by John Florio and published by him in collusion with George Chapman and others . . . as an attack upon Shakespeare." Acheson commends Thorpe (p. 43) for succeeding "fairly well" in arranging the disorganized sonnets, but adds the very inaccurate statement that his order "has remained almost unquestioned for three hundred years." Sh. (p. 35) "had no hand in their publication," yet Thorpe (pp. 43 f.) worked from the original manuscripts, where, although "the Sonnets as a whole were probably disorganized . . . , he apparently found several small sequences, and one fairly large sequence (1 to 17), in their original order." Acheson is certain that 1-126 are "divided naturally into seven groups. . . . Two or three of these groups are complete in twenty sonnet sequences [*sic*]; from this I infer that all of the sonnets were originally written in sequences of twenty, . . . and that where a book lacks this number, those lacking to make twenty are lost." The seven groups display "divergent moods quite distinct and readily distinguishable each from the others." The first book (pp. 46-48) is conventional; the second expresses the poet's own emotions and describes his relations with his patron; the third deals with Southampton and the dark lady; the fourth, purely lyrical, is a "confident and joyous sequence which celebrates a restored friendship between Shakespeare and Southampton, after separation and estrangement"; the fifth deals with the rival poet; the sixth is pervaded by "an abiding sense of apathy"; while the seventh is "a trumpet blast to action," calling the poet's soul to awake from the unhealthy lethargy caused by its master's sin with the dark woman. Sonnets 127-152 (p. 45) "are the small remains of what were originally at least two, and possibly three or four, twenty sonnet sequences written to Mistress Davenant." But 129 and 146 belong to the first series, 21 to the second, while 145 "is palpably not by" Sh. Acheson reprints the sonnets according to their (supposedly) original order, correlating them with dramas composed during the same years, and making the whole tell some peculiar news about Sh.'s biography.

I. 1-17, 20

II. 50, 51, 44, 45, 30, 31, 39, 113, 114, 24, 46, 47, 43, 27, 28, 61, 75, 48, 52, 26

III. 58, 57, 95, 96, 70, 94, 33-35, 40-42

IV. 100, 108, 102, 56, 97-99, 53, 54, 101, 18, 19, 104, 106, 107, 64, 65, 55

V (Rival Poet Book). 49, 88-93, 69, 78, 38, 79, 80, 82-87, 32, 81

VI. 66-68, 59, 60, 22, 62, 63, 73, 74, 146, 71, 72, 76, 105, 23, 103, 77, 126

VII. 29, 37, 36, 111, 112, 120, 121, 129, 119, 118, 117, 110, 109, 122, 115, 123, 116, 125, 124, 25

Sonnets to the Dark Lady: 128, 143, 136, 135, 144, 134, 133, 127, 132, 21, 130, 131, 148, 149, 141, 138, 152, 142, 139, 137, 150, 151, 140, 147

Sonnets to the Dark Lady (probably "the first sonnets that were written by Shakespeare"): 154, 153

Sonnet to the Dark Lady by "another of her many admirers": 145

The foregoing arrangement, based as it is on an elaborate and capricious "sonnet story," has little to commend it, no facts or logic to support it. Newspaper reviewers, however, lavished upon it complimentary adverbs and adjectives.

In *Shakespeare*, 1922 (pp. 123-125), ALDEN restated his agnostic opinions. The sonnets are printed in Q, he declares, in a sequence for which only Thorpe is responsible, a fact that accounts for their obvious discontinuity and their "many elements of miscellaneousness." "Many a pretty theory, biographical and otherwise, would have perished at birth (or sooner), if these things had been observed." "On the whole, our inference would be that the poems came into the editor's hands on many independent sheets of manuscript, but with a number of sonnets either grouped on single sheets fastened together for the purpose,—groupings which might originally have been dispatched like letters, and have been preserved in the proper connection,—while for the most part he was left to his own resources in determining the order. This is all that a rationally agnostic attitude will permit us to say." Hence a literary critic is "free to consider them first of all as poems, proper to be read in whatever order their contents make desirable, and to be interpreted with reference to what we may know of Shakespeare's lyric art."

FORREST (*Five Authors*, 1923, pp. 16-19) makes most of the previous and subsequent rearrangers look like hidebound Tories. His springboard into the realm of fancy and imagination was the firm assurance that Sh. could not possibly have written all the sonnets, because many are of inferior workmanship, inferior inspiration. By a series of ten decidedly unusual "propositions" he persuaded himself, if not his readers in India and elsewhere, that the one hundred fifty-four sonnets resulted from a round-robin, in which the poetic muse was turned on and off like the tap of a beer cask in an Elizabethan tavern. They "consist of 140 *serial* sonnets divided into thirteen series, plus a group of 14 *non-serial* or 'occasional' sonnets." The first eight series are the work of Sh. and of Barnes, William Warner, and probably Donne "writing in their own persons as competitors in a more or less serious literary contest, in which the Earl of Southampton combined the functions of addressee, umpire, and prize-giver." Five other series are dramatic. They are addressed to a woman by the four poets already named, in conjunction with another, probably Samuel Daniel. The fourteenth series (p. 172) consists of "occasional pieces of little value and uncertain authorship." Thorpe played a role of importance after the "themes" had been written (p. 188): "Having before him a MS. of the sonnets arranged in their original thirteen series and one 'Occasional' group precisely as they have been arranged in this book, [he] decided to break up the series and rearrange the sonnets in such a way as to conceal their *competitive* character, and give them the appearance of having been written by a single author." He did so on an ingenious "catchword system," which everybody but Forrest had, up to 1923, failed to understand. In accordance with these

disclosures Forrest (pp. 187-201) tabulates a new arrangement for the sonnet-eering quintuplets that presents much the appearance of a Chinese puzzle or of a Massachusetts income-tax blank, and its mysteries I have not seriously attempted to unravel. EDWARD SHANKS (*London Mercury*, 1924, IX, 664) well dismisses Forrest's theory as "all very ingenious indeed. The only trouble about it is that it is founded entirely on such internal evidence as is quite worthless for such a purpose."

REED (ed. 1923, p. 94), like Forrest, is discontented but infinitely more forbearing: "There is no reason to assume that the original publisher, Thorpe, was close enough to Shakespeare to understand fully the different MSS. out of which he may have combined the whole series. . . . Some sonnets are clearly out of their natural order (cf. Nos. 70, 77, 81). It is not at all certain that all . . . before No. 126 must refer to the youth Shakespeare praised."

FISCHER's *Sh.'s Sonette* appeared posthumously in 1925. Long study had confirmed his opinion that Thorpe's order is not Sh.'s. 1-126 deal with a friendship between two men which falls into three phases: first, a period of happiness; second, one of conflict; and third, one of reconciliation. 127-152 apparently constitute a separate and unrelated series dealing with a love affair between a man and a woman. But the "three-character" sonnets, 40-42 and 133, 134, 144, which refer to the poet, the friend, and the mistress, revealed to Fischer that in their original order the sonnets fell into a single series describing the triangle relationship of two men and a woman. On this hypothesis Fischer evolved a plot scheme for a reorganized sequence:

I. The poet's happy friendship with a man, followed by a happy love affair with a consequent waning of the friendship

II. A renewal of the friendship, followed by the discovery that the friend has become the poet's rival in love; a breach between the friends

III. The death of the poet's love for the woman and the resumption of the friendship

To make this story-cycle Fischer classified the sonnets according to their tone, grouping them by moods or predominant emotions. Seven sonnets could not be placed in his scheme: 107 and 124 he appended to his cycle as late friendship sonnets; as doubtfully Sh.'s he omitted the "Cupid" sonnets, 153 and 154, and the "Blonde" sonnets, 97-99. His final arrangement, grouped in its three phases, is as follows:

I. 18, 19, 63, 65, 67, 68, 59, 106, 62, 70; 26, 38, 103, 32, 71, 72; 20, 23, 122, 123; 53, 54; 15-17, 1, 4, 11, 12, 5, 6, 14, 8-10, 2, 7, 3, 13, 126; 55, 81, 60, 73, 74; 22, 24, 113, 114, 25, 30, 31, 77; 39, 52, 44-47, 29, 37, 66; 127, 132, 21, 130, 128, 145, 135, 136, 143, 140; 50, 51, 27, 28, 43, 61; 56, 151, 75

II. 100-102, 109, 117, 118, 125; 78-80, 82-86; 112, 111, 36, 64, 49; 48, 57, 58, 33-35, 139; 40-42, 133, 134, 144; 88-90, 87, 91-96, 131

III. 69, 121, 142, 150, 148, 141, 149; 138, 152, 147, 137, 129, 146; 110, 119, 120; 104, 105, 76; 108, 115, 116

J. D. WILSON (*R. E. S.*, 1926, II, 350-354) finds Fischer's theory, "apart from minor crudities, . . . convincing," and his book "of first-class impor-

tance."¹ On the other hand, FORT (the same, pp. 439-445) is unimpressed by the German scholar's arguments. If a Southamptonite like Fort disagrees with Fischer, adherents of other theories of the friend's identity will of course dissent more vehemently still. WOLFF (*E. S.*, 1928, LXIII, 112) says—in my opinion wisely—that such a rearrangement as Fischer's, "which is undertaken only subjectively, in which the wish is father to the thought, and in which a continuity is found because the theory of the critic must find it, is arbitrariness and makes the *thema probandum* into a *thema probatum*."

The scheme of BRAY (ed. 1925) was published almost simultaneously with Fischer's. He emphasized the novelty of his method (pp. 2 f.): all previous "arrangements have a subjective basis. They are based partly on what each editor, often under the stimulus of some splendid or provocative theory, holds to be identity of subject; partly on aesthetics and the like. . . . I can lay claim to no such triumph of ingenuity. . . . It is no new theory that I have to set forth. Only one hard fact:—the mechanical coupling of sonnet to sonnet by rhyme-link." He had noticed that various sonnets admittedly connected in Q by position and subject-matter repeated rime-words; and that others, separated in Q but called related by editors like Pooler, had the same sort of linking by identical words or identical sounds. "The orderly disorder" of Q (p. 43) is "a veil of Shakespeare's own making, to hide or at least to shield his secrets." The veil is then torn away, the secrets are bared, by an allocation based upon recurring rimes, such as *behind: mind* and *mind: kind* in 9 and 10; *face: disgrace* in 33 and 34; *woe: know, mind: behind* and *slow: know, slow: go, find: wind* in 34 and 35. Even *you* and *thou* are called to the witness chair, and the verdict rendered is (pp. 38 f.) that "the *thou*-sonnets are Shakespeare's earlier, the other [the *you*-] sonnets Shakespeare's later and more mature work." "The *thou*-sonnets . . . form a harmonious chain by themselves." Bray's order runs:

I. Adoration: 20, 91, 25, 31, 53, 62, 22, 18

II. Invitation to Marriage and Escape from Mortality in Fatherhood: 126, 65, 15, 16, 13, 11, 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, 14, 5, 6, 8, 3, 17, 12, 7

III. Thoughts in Absence, Longings and Broodings: 24, 46, 47, 75, 52, 48, 50, 51, 44, 45, 27, 43, 61, 28

IV. Forebodings of Death, Self-Depreciation, Jealousy of the Rival Poet: 73, 74, 81, 66, 71, 32, 72, 103, 84-86, 80, 79, 101, 83, 105, 38, 78, 82, 21

V. Warnings against the Slanders and Contamination of the World: 70, 69, 67, 54

VI. Reproaches for the Breaking of a Twofold Truth, Hers and His; Forebodings of Desertion; Forgiveness: 33, 34, 42, 40, 95, 96, 92, 57, 93, 58, 88, 89, 35, 41

VII. Triumph of Love over Silence and Separation, over the Passage of Time, the Poms and Vicissitudes of the World: 97, 56, 98, 102, 100, 63, 19, 68, 104, 99, 77, 122, 125, 76, 123, 115, 124, 107, 55, 106, 59

VIII. Remorse, Confession, Despondency and Farewell: 108, 26, 23, 49, 113, 114, 121, 109, 117, 116, 120, 112, 39, 36, 90, 30, 94, 111, 60, 64, 37, 110, 119, 118, 29, 87

¹ It was poorly received by KELLER (*Jahrbuch*, 1926, LXII, 167 f.).

IX. The Dark Lady: 145, 128, 154, 151, 136, 135, 143, 134, 133, 152, 142, 140, 132, 127, 131, 141, 137-139, 149, 153, 130, 148, 147, 150, 129, 144, 146

Noticeably the companion sonnets 153 and 154 are widely separated in Bray's volume, where they have the unexpected numbers 147 and 129. He also separates 64 from 65 and 67 from 68, in spite of their obvious connections. These facts alone shake one's confidence in his method. A reviewer in 1925 (*T. L. S.*, November 26, p. 797) further invites attention to 57 and 58, which clearly belong together, but which Bray separates by 113, because they have no rime-word in common; and to six sonnets with the identical rime *days: praise* which he fails to keep together. "Thus it turns out . . . that the new 'objective' method is really as subjective as any other," and this new regrouping "is no better than another; in some obvious respects it seems worse than many." ANNA BENEDETTI (*Rivista d'Italia*, 1928, XXXI, i, 120-129) cordially and FERDINANDO NERI (*Saggi di letteratura*, 1936, p. 254) with slight qualifications endorsed Bray's scheme. It was rejected by ROBERTSON (*Problems*, 1926, pp. 95-101), by REINECKE (*Jahrbuch*, 1927, LXIII, 215-217), by MARSCHALL (*Beiblatt*, 1928, XXXIX, 99-102), and by CHAMBERS (*William Sh.*, 1930, I, 561 f.). The persuasive Robertson was not so much interested in providing a new arrangement for the sonnets as in eliminating a large number erroneously assigned to Sh. Chambers observed that Bray's rime-links are "sometimes the same words and sometimes merely words that rhyme together, and they may come in any line of a sonnet. According to the theory, the 'Thou' sonnets were written first on this principle, and the 'You' sonnets dovetailed in later by similar links. It is difficult to think of Shakespeare as occupying himself through a span of years with an exercise of such profitless ingenuity. Moreover, there are many recurrent rhymes in the sonnets, and different arrangements could be worked out on Bray's lines. Much would depend upon the arbitrary selection of this or that sonnet for a starting-point. . . . It does not seem to me likely . . . that the whole collection can have been kept together by any one but Shakespeare himself. And if so, it is most likely that the arrangement of 1609 was his. It does not, of course, follow that in putting them together he made no departure from the chronological order of composition."

If Bray's method of settling the problem met with less success than he had anticipated, none the less it seems to have encouraged disbelief in the validity of the 1609 arrangement, which both NOYES in 1924 (*New Essays*, 1927, pp. 103-105, 113) and COWLING (*Preface*, 1925, pp. 39, 78) dismiss as arbitrary. Thorpe, Noyes believes, arranged the sonnets to tell a story, just as a modern bookseller might make Browning's lyrics into a striking narrative of "A Light Woman."

Unluckily I have been unable to see HAUER's German translation, 1929, so that I must depend on a review in which GROTH (*Beiblatt*, 1930, XLI, 139) writes: "[Hauer] places 26 first, as the real dedicatory poem, and groups the other one hundred fifty-three sonnets according to the principle of similar theme. The first group is that of the tenth Muse; the second contains the beauty sonnets or master-mistress sonnets; the third, the so-called propagation poems; the fourth, the spite sonnets; the fifth, those about faith and con-

stancy; the sixth, those about despondency; the seventh, those about ardent desire; the eighth, those about friendship; the ninth, those about resignation; the tenth, those about estrangement; the eleventh to the thirteenth, those which are love poems; the fourteenth group contains the ascetic, gloomy sonnets, 129, 121, 66, 146. The mythological sonnets 153 and 154 form the conclusion."

In 1932 L'HOMMEDÉ (*Secret de Sh.*) translated the sonnets into French. He had (see p. 261, below) a bizarre "secret" to disclose, and he tried to give it an air of plausibility—with no success whatever—by establishing this order:

1-20, 23-31, 39, 43-48, 50-53, 56-59, 61, 67-70, 75, 97-99, 153, 154, 145, 135, 136, 143, 128, 151, 139, 140, 146, 49, 88, 90-93, 89, 21, 32, 84, 76, 79, 82, 80, 86, 85, 83, 103, 102, 110, 111, 113, 121, 125, 33, 87, 132, 142, 127, 77, 104, 22, 122, 112, 71-74, 64, 38, 54, 55, 60, 63, 65, 78, 81, 37, 100, 101, 105, 106, 108, 109, 114-119, 123, 124, 126, 131, 130, 141, 137, 147, 150, 152, 138, 148, 149, 94-96, 34, 35, 40-42, 62, 36, 133, 134, 129, 144, 120, 66, 107

KELLNER (*E. S.*, 1933, LXVIII, 60 f., 64, 79) felt certain that Sh. had nothing to do with Q. If he had had any interest in it or in the sonnets, he would have changed their order. His "contemporaries and no less the readers of the next two centuries regarded each sonnet as in itself a unit expressing a complete thought with no reference to anything that went before or came after." Hence in reading Q one should not be enticed "into regarding that which chance joined as something that is actually coherent." DOUGLAS devoted much of his *True History*, 1933, to attacking the interpretative theories of the sonnets enunciated by Harris and Butler. But, none the less, he paid the latter an unusual compliment (p. 30): "Thorpe, whether by accident or by design, disarranged the order of the Sonnets, and I take Butler's rearrangement of their order as a valuable piece of editing. Under Butler's arrangement the 'Story' of the Sonnets emerges in a much more coherent form, and the episode of the 'dark woman' falls into what I take to be its quite subsidiary place." Douglas makes two slight modifications in Butler's scheme, making 126 number 1 as a prologue to the sequence and restoring 129 to its original place between 128 and 130.

Meanwhile, the anti-Stratfordians had zestfully entered the rearranging contest. To LATHAM DAVIS (*Sh. England's Ulysses*, 1905) "Sh." is a blind for "Essex," and, with wasted ingenuity, he conceives of 1-154 as a masque of five acts, twenty-two scenes, a dedication, and an epilogue:

Dedication to Homer: 26, 77

Act I: 25, 14, 65, 58, 23, 57, 62, 105, 16, 52, 37, 56, 43, 129, 36, 39, 74, 149, 136, 64, 11, 63, 8, 9

Act II: 151, 111, 35, 60, 125, 146, 59, 124, 21, 128, 138, 48, 44, 50, 45, 51, 103, 137, 152, 142, 66, 147, 145, 143, 6, 72, 2, 13

Act III: 1, 75, 10, 123, 91, 69, 85, 70, 117, 141, 110, 139, 140, 53, 144, 33, 114, 20, 121, 92, 32, 93, 109, 133, 42, 134, 97, 73, 113, 49, 76, 34, 104, 22, 94, 126, 15, 4, 17, 7

Act IV: 18, 106, 83, 107, 119, 29, 95, 87, 46, 24, 47, 116, 86, 82, 148, 78, 54, 98, 99, 102, 27, 28, 41, 71, 88, 79, 96, 90, 3, 12, 5

Act V: 84, 112, 115, 80, 150, 89, 120, 135, 100, 118, 61, 40, 101, 127, 130, 132, 67, 131, 68, 38, 30, 19, 108, 122, 81, 31, 55

Epilogue: 153, 154

B. G. THEOBALD (*Sh.'s Sonnets Unmasked*, 1929, pp. 70 f.), a Baconian, supposes that some qualified person saw the sonnets through the press, but that the order proposed by BRAY is preferable: "To my own mind the argument carries much weight, and one feels that it might at least be accepted provisionally. I should, of course, substitute the name Bacon for the name Shakespeare." Another, DODD (*Personal Poems of Francis Bacon*, 1931), furnishes some innocent mirth with his wholesale revamping of the Q sequence. Rosicrucian symbolism hands him the key to Bacon's sonnet-biography, which he restores to "correct numerical and chronological order," beginning with 23 ("A Foreword") and ending with 71, 153, 154. "New lamps for old" might describe Dodd, and in his entirely arbitrary and indefensible arrangement the sonnets appear novel indeed.

Sometimes Oxfordians, like B. R. WARD (*Poetry and the Play*, 1929-30, XIII [No. 87], 20, 30), GILBERT STANDEN (*Sh. Authorship*, 1930), and M. W. DOUGLAS (*Earl of Oxford as "Sh.,"* 1931), and Baconian-Oxfordians, like PERCY ALLEN (*Case for Edward de Vere*, 1930), have "proved" their case against Sh.'s authorship by adopting BRAY's 1925 rearrangement and making it apply to Oxford's life. Allen speaks fervently (pp. 178 n., 150 f.) of "the immense value of . . . Bray's discovery," which he calls "vitally important" in determining the true authorship of the sonnets, while Standen (p. 46) echoes that only in Bray's book can be found the "true order" of Sh.-Oxford's poems. Sir Denys had supposed (p. 41) that his "wonderful voyage of discovery" was steered to a Shakespearean harbor only, so that its diversion to another port by Theobald, Standen, Allen, and the rest must have been a cruel blow. Perhaps he was slightly consoled when the Oxfordian RENDALL (*Sh. Sonnets*, 1930, p. 76 n.) rejected completely "the shallowness" of his "proposed readjustments," and followed Q.

Unluckily for their cause, the dissenters can agree no better than the believers. So PHILLIPS (*Tragic Story of "Sh.,"* 1932, p. 29), utterly disregarding his brothers-in-heresy, confidently announced that "nothing more is necessary . . . for an understanding of these wonderful poems but to read them sympathetically in the order in which they here follow"—an order that supposedly reveals "Sh." as the Earl of Oxford. Sympathetic readers may wish to try it out:¹

107; 26, 99, 75, 52, 24, 46, 47; 100, 104, 103, 37, 113, 62, 114, 43, 98; 50, 51, 44, 45, 27, 61, 28, 97; 125, 25, 124, 66, 29, 30, 60, 15; 23, 106, 53, 68, 54, 31, 55, 81, 72, 105, 18, 65, 48, 22, 108; 101, 76, 38, 36, 14, 49, 56, 102, 115; 21, 79, 80, 78, 85, 70, 82-84, 86; 39, 64, 116, 59, 32, 71, 63; 67, 19, 16, 17, 3, 1, 8, 4-7, 12, 11, 2, 9, 10, 13; 91-93, 96, 69, 95, 58, 57, 117, 109, 110, 112, 118, 119; 41, 42, 40, 111, 34, 35, 33; 77, 122, 94, 129, 88-90, 121; 123, 120, 73, 74, 150, 149, 148, 87, 147, 146; 135, 136, 143; 144, 133, 134, 139, 140, 132, 141, 142, 152, 127, 137, 138; (of doubtful authorship) 126, 20, 128, 153, 154, 130, 131, 151

¹ He omits 145.

By 1934 PHILLIPS (*Sh.'s Sonnets*) had wholly changed his views.¹ Now without mentioning any "non-Stratford" author, he grouped the sonnets so that (p. v) "they may seem rather to be stanzas of one harmonious piece than isolated poems." He admits that whether he has "approached the true sequence or diverged from it is a considerable question," but hopes that he has made "the Sonnets less obscure, and their great beauty more apparent." Perhaps most people, accustomed to the text of Q, will feel that the hope is unrealized. His potpourri follows:

24, 62, 46, 47, 52, 75, 113, 114, 98, 103, 104, 99, 100, 50, 51, 44, 45, 27, 43, 61, 28, 30, 60, 64, 26, 107, 125, 124, 29, 48, 97, 101, 55, 106, 59, 68, 31, 18, 25, 66, 63, 37, 22, 23, 65, 32, 108, 102, 72, 81, 71, 115, 105, 53, 54, 83, 76, 86, 80, 84, 85, 67, 79, 38, 78, 21, 70, 2, 1, 8, 5, 6, 3, 4, 14, 10, 9, 11, 7, 12, 19, 17, 16, 13, 15, 33, 49, 92, 93, 109, 121, 96, 95, 82, 69, 111, 94, 36, 39, 91, 89, 88, 90, 129, 58, 57, 110, 116, 117, 35, 118, 119, 56, 112, 77, 122, 41, 42, 40, 34, 149, 148, 147, 150, 87, 120, 123, 73, 74, 146, 144, 139, 132, 127, 137, 133, 134, 141, 142, 152, 140, 145, 143, 136, 135, 151, 126, 20, 128, 130, 131, 138, 153, 154

In 1935 PHILLIPS published an optimistically entitled volume, *Sunlight on Sh.'s Sonnets*, which elucidates the classification adopted by him in the preceding year.² He explains (p. 13) that the poems fall into two series, the first "concerned with one individual—the poet's son," the second "with a wife whom the poet had just married, and her relations with the poet's son (her stepson)." The poet is called Sh., but more is meant than meets the eye (see pp. 275 f., below). Phillips made his 1934 rearrangement in order (p. 10) that the sonnets "should progress evenly with the progress of adolescence" in Sh.'s son Will, "and so that those praising innocence should precede those blaming the vices which superseded it," and so on. But base clouds o'ertake us as we read.

To return to the strait path. DANNENBERG (*Jahrbuch*, 1934, LXX, 43) says that for Q Thorpe followed a manuscript in which the separate lyrics had been grouped "with more love than skill." "All attempts to find an ordered sequence" in it, KNIGHTS (*Scrutiny*, 1934, III, 134 f.) urges, should be abandoned, though Q represents "a rough approximation to the time order" in which the sonnets were composed. "Few editors . . . and probably fewer readers," according to RIDLEY (ed. 1934, pp. xi f.), "have ever been wholly satisfied with the order of 1609." This may be true of the editors. It seems to me not true of the average reader, who is likely to be annoyed at finding the sonnets out of their familiar succession, and who is certain to be vexed at encountering a tricky renumbering and usually no first-line index (the sonnet editors are allergic to indexes), so that to locate a wanted sonnet is almost like searching a haystack for a needle. All the rearrangements made before 1925 seemed to Ridley unsatisfactory, because they were supported "by nothing

¹ See p. 276 n., below.

² It reprints the sonnets in the 1934 order except for the last thirteen, which are rearranged thus: 143, 136, 135, 126, 20, 128, 153, 154, 138, 130, 131, 151, 145. But in a tabular view of the new order (pp. 199 f.) the 1934 order is reproduced exactly.

more secure than the personal idiosyncrasy and insight of the individual editor or reader." "Either the 1609 order is Shakespeare's own, and then there is no more to be said, or else it is not, and then it has exactly as much or as little authority as any other order of any date." Though a weakness (p. 165) of BRAY's scheme is the way in which 153 and 154, neither of which "has any business in the series," are separated, Ridley heartily approves it as a whole because (p. xiv) "by the application of a perfectly mechanical criterion, which is in no way dependent on the idiosyncrasies of any editor, an order of the sonnets is produced which makes them a far more coherent and readable series than the order of 1609." Bray's criterion (p. xii) "can be rigidly applied by anyone irrespective of his taste." "Perfectly mechanical" and "rigidly" are not words one thinks of in connection with great poetry, particularly that of Sh., but Ridley adopted Bray's arrangement, and the same flattery had earlier been paid by the Dutch translator DECROOS in his edition of the sonnets (1933) as well as by B. G. THEOBALD (1929).

Obviously BROOKE (ed. 1936) saw little merit in Bray's "perfectly mechanical criterion," which he passes over in silence. His own discussion is interesting, even when it fails to carry conviction. He repeats the orthodox statement (pp. 17 f.) that 1-126 were written to the friend. They are linked (pp. 19-29) at times by syntax, as 5 and 6, 27 and 28, 44 and 45; by verbal echoes, as 8-11, 46 and 47, 82 and 83, 111 and 112; or by theme, as 50 and 51, 64 and 65, 123 and 124. Probably they were composed in groups of from two to five and sent to the friend as opportunity permitted. They were written on single sheets of paper that "were the ultimate basis" of the Q text. Disarrangement of these sheets is responsible for "the occasional dislocation of groups," but "a perfect ear would be able to distinguish, not only their actual order, but also the contents of each particular packet that passed from Shakespeare to his friend." The perfect ear is unfortunately lacking. Undismayed thereby, Brooke distinguishes in the series (p. 26) thirteen isolated poems and thirty-eight groups. His reconstruction of the "actual order" runs:

I. *The Fair Youth*

- A. Invitation to Marriage: 1-17
- B. Friend to Friend: 18-26
- C. The Poet Travelling: 27-32
- D. The Dark Lady: 33-35, 40-42
- E. The Friend's Absence: 36-39, 43-47
- F. Shakespeare's Second Absence: 48-55
- G. Loneliness: 56-58, 61
- H. Beauty and Time: 62-65, 59, 60
- I. The Corrupting World: 66-70, 94-96
- K. Contemplation of Death: 81, 71-74
- L. New Year Greetings: 76, 75, 77
- M. The Rival Poets: 78-80, 82-86
- N. Fears of Alienation: 87-93
- O. The Truant Muse: 97-103
- P. Saint Martin's Summer: 104-108, 115, 116
- Q. Shakespeare's Fourth Absence: 113, 114
- R. Business Versus Friendship: 109-112

S. The Poet's Transgression: 117-120

T. His Defiance: 121-125

Valediction: 126

The second series, 127-152, is (pp. 28 f.) "far more disordered" than the first. It should be "in seven groups . . . around the pivotal song-sonnet" 145. The last two sonnets (pp. 56 f.) were written "on commission. . . . [Sh. was] presented with a Greek epigram on a warm spring and asked to turn it into a complimentary poem for a lady, presumably of Bath."

II. *The Dark Lady*

A. Semi-Jocose Compliment: 127, 128, 130

B. Shakespeare's Wooing: 131, 150, 132, 148, 137, 139-142, 149

C. The Other Wills: 143, 135, 136

D. Song of Triumph: 145

E. Fruition: 151, 138

F. The Dark Lady and the Friend: 144, 133, 134

G. The Dark Lady Dismissed: 152, 147

H. The Moral: 129, 146

Unrelated Pair on a Lady of Bath (?): 153, 154

S. C. CHEW (New York *Herald Tribune Books*, February 21, 1937, p. 19) heartily applauds the foregoing system, saying, "Today there is universal [*sic*] agreement that there is something seriously wrong" with the Q order. He fails to emphasize the peculiar fact that Brooke is a whole-hearted Southamptinite,—a fact that influences his regroupings, and that will antagonize agnostics and addicts to other autobiographical theories. Objections of another sort are raised by BULLOUGH (*M. L. R.*, 1939, XXXIV, 592 f.), who says that Brooke's "result is arbitrary and in finding some links he has overlooked others." He puts 94-96 after 70, "but 94 carries on the thought of 92-3, substituting the image of 'Lilies that fester' for that of 'Eve's apple' . . . in 93. The tone of 70, with its faint suspicion, is far removed from that of these other poems, which . . . may well have been written later." So too he places 81 with 71-74, but in these "the attitude to death is different." Such details "suggest the doubtful propriety of . . . Brooke's rearrangement."

KITTREDGE (ed. 1936) reprints the sonnets in the order of Q, but in his preliminary remarks (pp. 1491 f.) voices deep suspicion of its validity. "It is customary," he points out, to describe 1-126 "as a continuous series and to assume that they are all addressed to the same person. . . . This idea takes it for granted that Thorpe's arrangement is Shakespeare's. That, however, is a pure assumption." To compare 108 with 70 "is enough to destroy the theory of a continuous and orderly series," for 108 "calls the recipient 'sweet boy,'" while 70 "is addressed to some one who has 'pass'd by the ambush of young days.'" Also "it is quite clear that . . . [127-154] do not make an orderly sequence"; and if the dark woman "is to be identified with the stolen mistress of . . . [40-42], that is further disproof of the continuity and completeness of the supposed first cycle [1-126]."

In 1938 BRAY, after years devoted to the pursuit of rime-links, reedited the sonnets in an order somewhat changed from that of 1925:

I. *The Fair Youth*

- A. Devotion: 20, 91, 25, 31, 53, 62, 22, 18
- B. Marry and defy Mortality: 126, 65, 15, 16, 13, 11, 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, 14, 5, 6, 8, 3, 12, 7, 17
- C. Thoughts in Absence: 24, 46, 47, 75, 52, 48, 50, 51, 44, 45, 27, 43, 61, 28
- D. Forebodings of Death: 73, 74, 81, 66, 71, 32, 72
- E. Jealousy and The Rival Poet: 103, 84-86, 80, 79, 101, 83, 105, 38, 78, 21, 82, 67, 54
- F. Gathering Suspicions: 70, 69, 92, 58, 88, 89, 57, 93
- G. Reproaches and Forgiveness: 33, 34, 42, 40, 95, 96, 35, 41
- H. Triumph of Love over Separation and Age: 97, 56, 98, 102, 100, 63, 19, 68, 104, 99
- I. And over Time and Vicissitude: 77, 122, 125, 76, 123, 115, 124, 107, 55, 106, 59, 108
- J. Transgression and Remorse: 26, 23, 49, 113, 114, 121, 109, 117, 116, 120, 112, 39, 36, 90, 30, 94, 111
- K. Farewell: 60, 64, 37, 110, 119, 118, 29, 87

II. *The Dark Lady*

- A. Mortgag'd to thy Will: 145, 128, 151, 136, 135, 143, 134, 133
- B. My Love is as a Fever: 152, 142, 150, 147, 154, 153, 130, 148, 139, 140, 132, 127, 131, 141, 149, 137, 138

III. *The End*

129, 144, 146

Bray's revision must shake the faith of readers in his "perfectly mechanical criterion," especially since (p. v) he calls his earlier work "immature" and his arguments therein "inadequate." (One of his converts, IAN COLVIN [*Atlantic Monthly*, 1929, CXLIV, 62], had described the 1925 book as a "wonderful effort of constructive criticism," a "Rosetta stone of Shakespearean scholarship.") Perhaps, too, he shakes it again when (pp. 11 f.) he refers to the differences in rearrangements of the sonnets since Knight, and makes the honest comment, "Those differences may indeed point to the hopelessness of the search and to the moral that we had better be content with the order in the Quarto; they are no proof that there was nothing lost." But he has the almost unique distinction of having perpetuated his first rearrangement in editions by several other men—who may well have regretted following his 1925 version after that of 1938 appeared.

Whether BALDENSPERGER, whose French translation is now ready for the press, will, like Bray, acquire disciples may perhaps be doubted. He informs me that he has classified the sonnets into seven sections: (1) True Love through the Eyes; (2) Absence; (3) Encouragement for Posterity; (4) Fighting against Time; (5) Rivals in Favor; (6) The Dark Lady; (7) Worries of a Disturbed Affection. The sixth group has great originality. "Admitting that William Harvey had picked up the Sonnets concerning the 'dark lady' as they had reached his detested stepson [Southampton], and had been unable to 'arrange' them as he had done for the first 17, I propose to read them backwards in order to re-establish chronology and sense." The order 154-127 *is* at least something entirely new under the sun.

The question how the sonnets should be grouped is dismissed by SPENCER (*Art and Life*, 1940, p. 33) with curt brevity: "We have no reason to suppose that their appearance in 1609 was in either the chronological order of their composition or the arrangement the author would have adopted. Various schemes of rearrangement have been proposed, some rather ingenious, some downright silly. None convinces." We should all try to remember, however, that what seems silly to a critic may seem perfectly serious, even impressive in scholarship and intuition, to the proposer. Of course by far the majority of editors have printed the sonnets exactly in Thorpe's order, which, by a mere show of editorial hands, has an enormous vote in its favor; but, even so, many follow Thorpe, not because they think his sequence correct, but because they despair of producing any that will be better, or merely because they conform to tradition. TANNENBAUM (*Dial*, 1914, LVI, 499) tartly writes that the regroupings of every "meddler since Thomas Thorpe" have been "wholly unnecessary," and that "no one ever takes the trouble to read them." But the fact that almost no one will accept another person's classification of the sonnets does not in the slightest degree indicate that the grouping of Q is correct. It might, one feels, show that such rearrangements, being purely personal, *are* futile and unnecessary. "Think," said RALEIGH in 1908 (*Letters*, ed. Lady Raleigh, 1926, II, 336), "of the mathematical chances against a complete rearrangement for 154 sonnets falling exactly into Shakespeare's order! It's like putting the 1st Scene of Macbeth together from the component words."

"It is a sad day for a man," wrote a *T. L. S.* reviewer (November 26, 1925, p. 797), "when he becomes entangled . . . in the problem of the order of Shakespeare's sonnets. His happiness is departed; his mind is no longer his own. He is in the condition of those who set themselves to work out a system of breaking the bank at Monte Carlo." However that be, the rearrangers do no harm. They amuse themselves as with a jig-saw puzzle. But probably every person who tries to track down variant readings in the sonnets, certainly everyone who attempts to collate word for word the entire hundred fifty-four, will indulge in unkind thoughts of them and their ordinarily unindexed work (WALSH [ed. 1908] is a particularly horrible example), and will pray for the establishment of the Q order so far as reprinting and editing are concerned. To be sure, his prayer will be unanswered; for, of little faith, he will know that at any moment he may expect a new method, plucking the heart out of Sh.'s mystery, revealing some story never before imagined. The field is wide open, the opportunities for research are enormous. Mathematically, the possible rearrangements of the one hundred fifty-four sonnets are to all intents innumerable: billions, trillions, octillions, and the like are numbers too small to limit them. Indeed, a mathematical friend assures me that the number of possible rearrangements is considerably greater than the number of electrons credited by ARTHUR EDDINGTON (*Expanding Universe*, 1933, p. 96) as being in the universe. Only a few rearrangements have as yet been proposed, and, with its surface hardly scratched, here is one Shakespearean problem to which endless further solutions can (and will) be made.

In tabular form I give an analysis of the results attained by twenty rearrangements from 1640 to 1938. The facts it presents are enlightening and amusing, and they might well give pause to anybody who thinks he has found the certain key to Sh.'s own order.

TABLE SHOWING THE NUMERICAL ORDER ASSIGNED TO THE SONNETS IN VARIOUS REARRANGEMENTS

Q 1609	Benson 1640	Knight 1841	Hugo 1857	Cartwright 1859	Bodenstedt 1862	Bodenstedt 1866	Massey 1866	Massey 1888	Krauss 1872	Velasco y Rojas 1877	Von Maunz 1894	Butler 1899	Godwin 1900	Stopes 1904	Walsh 1908	Acheson 1922	Fischer 1925	Bray 1925	Bray 1938	Brooke 1936
1	14	101	120	1	92	95	2	1	2	43	29	1	12	3	20	1	26	15	15	1
2	15	102	121	2	93	96	3	2	3	44	30	2	18	4	27	2	36	16	16	2
3	16	103	122	3	94	97	4	3	4	45	31	3	15	5	28	3	37	17	17	3
4	17	104	123	4	95	98	5	4	5	46	32	4	13	6	29	4	38	18	18	4
5	18	105	124	5	96	99	6	5	6	47	33	5	16	7	30	5	39	19	19	5
6	19	106	125	6	97	100	7	6	7	48	34	6	17	8	31	6	40	20	20	6
7	20	107	126	7	98	101	8	7	8	49	35	7	22	9	32	7	41	21	21	7
8	21	108	127	8	99	102	9	8	9	50	36	8	23	10	33	8	42	22	22	8
9	22	109	128	9	100	103	10	9	10	51	37	9	24	11	34	9	43	23	23	9
10	23	110	129	10	101	104	11	10	11	52	38	10	25	12	35	10	44	24	24	10
11	24	111	130	11	102	105	12	11	12	53	39	11	26	13	36	11	45	25	25	11
12	25	112	131	12	103	106	13	12	13	54	40	12	27	14	37	12	46	26	26	12
13	26	113	132	13	104	107	14	13	14	55	41	13	28	15	38	13	47	27	27	13
14	27	114	133	14	105	108	15	14	15	56	42	14	29	16	39	14	48	28	28	14
15	28	115	134	15	106	109	16	15	16	57	43	15	30	17	40	15	49	29	29	15
16	29	116	135	16	107	110	17	16	17	58	44	16	31	18	41	16	50	30	30	16
17	30	117	136	17	108	111	18	17	18	59	45	17	32	19	42	17	51	31	31	17
18	31	118	137	18	109	112	19	18	19	60	46	18	33	20	43	18	52	32	32	18
19	32	119	138	19	110	113	20	19	20	61	47	19	34	21	44	19	53	33	33	19
20	33	120	139	20	111	114	21	20	21	62	48	20	35	22	45	20	54	34	34	20
21	34	121	140	21	112	115	22	21	22	63	49	21	36	23	46	21	55	35	35	21
22	35	122	141	22	113	116	23	22	23	64	50	22	37	24	47	22	56	36	36	22
23	36	123	142	23	114	117	24	23	24	65	51	23	38	25	48	23	57	37	37	23
24	37	124	143	24	115	118	25	24	25	66	52	24	39	26	49	24	58	38	38	24
25	38	125	144	25	116	119	26	25	26	67	53	25	40	27	50	25	59	39	39	25
26	39	126	145	26	117	120	27	26	27	68	54	26	41	28	51	26	60	40	40	26
27	40	127	146	27	118	121	28	27	28	69	55	27	42	29	52	27	61	41	41	27
28	41	128	147	28	119	122	29	28	29	70	56	28	43	30	53	28	62	42	42	28
29	42	129	148	29	120	123	30	29	30	71	57	29	44	31	54	29	63	43	43	29
30	43	130	149	30	121	124	31	30	31	72	58	30	45	32	55	30	64	44	44	30
31	44	131	150	31	122	125	32	31	32	73	59	31	46	33	56	31	65	45	45	31
32	45	132	151	32	123	126	33	32	33	74	60	32	47	34	57	32	66	46	46	32
33	46	133	152	33	124	127	34	33	34	75	61	33	48	35	58	33	67	47	47	33
34	47	134	153	34	125	128	35	34	35	76	62	34	49	36	59	34	68	48	48	34
35	48	135	154	35	126	129	36	35	36	77	63	35	50	37	60	35	69	49	49	35
36	49	136	155	36	127	130	37	36	37	78	64	36	51	38	61	36	70	50	50	36
37	50	137	156	37	128	131	38	37	38	79	65	37	52	39	62	37	71	51	51	37
38	51	138	157	38	129	132	39	38	39	80	66	38	53	40	63	38	72	52	52	38
39	52	139	158	39	130	133	40	39	40	81	67	39	54	41	64	39	73	53	53	39
40	53	140	159	40	131	134	41	40	41	82	68	40	55	42	65	40	74	54	54	40
41	54	141	160	41	132	135	42	41	42	83	69	41	56	43	66	41	75	55	55	41
42	55	142	161	42	133	136	43	42	43	84	70	42	57	44	67	42	76	56	56	42
43	56	143	162	43	134	137	44	43	44	85	71	43	58	45	68	43	77	57	57	43
44	57	144	163	44	135	138	45	44	45	86	72	44	59	46	69	44	78	58	58	44
45	58	145	164	45	136	139	46	45	46	87	73	45	60	47	70	45	79	59	59	45
46	59	146	165	46	137	140	47	46	47	88	74	46	61	48	71	46	80	60	60	46
47	60	147	166	47	138	141	48	47	48	89	75	47	62	49	72	47	81	61	61	47
48	61	148	167	48	139	142	49	48	49	90	76	48	63	50	73	48	82	62	62	48
49	62	149	168	49	140	143	50	49	50	91	77	49	64	51	74	49	83	63	63	49
50	63	150	169	50	141	144	51	50	51	92	78	50	65	52	75	50	84	64	64	50
51	64	151	170	51	142	145	52	51	52	93	79	51	66	53	76	51	85	65	65	51
52	65	152	171	52	143	146	53	52	53	94	80	52	67	54	77	52	86	66	66	52
53	66	153	172	53	144	147	54	53	54	95	81	53	68	55	78	53	87	67	67	53
54	67	154	173	54	145	148	55	54	55	96	82	54	69	56	79	54	88	68	68	54
55	68	155	174	55	146	149	56	55	56	97	83	55	70	57	80	55	89	69	69	55
56	69	156	175	56	147	150	57	56	57	98	84	56	71	58	81	56	90	70	70	56
57	70	157	176	57	148	151	58	57	58	99	85	57	72	59	82	57	91	71	71	57
58	71	158	177	58	149	152	59	58	59	100	86	58	73	60	83	58	92	72	72	58
59	72	159	178	59	150	153	60	59	60	101	87	59	74	61	84	59	93	73	73	59
60	73	160	179	60	151	154	61	60	61	102	88	60	75	62	85	60	94	74	74	60
61	74	161	180	61	152	155	62	61	62	103	89	61	76	63	86	61	95	75	75	61
62	75	162	181	62	153	156	63	62	63	104	90	62	77	64	87	62	96	76	76	62
63	76	163	182	63	154	157	64	63	64	105	91	63	78	65	88	63	97	77	77	63
64	77	164	183	64	155	158	65	64	65	106	92	64	79	66	89	64	98	78	78	64
65	78	165	184	65	156	159	66	65	66	107	93	65	80	67	90	65	99	79	79	65
66	79	166	185	66	157	160	67	66	67	108	94	66	81	68	91	66	100	80	80	66
67	80	167	186	67	158	161	68	67	68	109	95	67	82	69	92	67	101	81	81	67
68	81	168	187	68	159	162	69	68	69	110	96	68	83	70	93	68	102	82	82	68
69	82	169	188	69	160	163	70	69	70	111	97	69	84	71	94	69	103	83	83	69
70	83	170	189	70	161	164	71	70	71	112	98	70	85	72	95	70	104	84	84	70
71	84	171	190	71	162	165	72	71	72	113	99	71	86	73	96	71	105	85	85	71
72	85	172	191	72	163	166	73	72	73	114	100	72	87	74	97	72	106	86	86	72
73	86	173	192	73	164	167	74	73	74	115	101	73	88	75	98	73	107	87	87	73
74	87	174	193	74	165	168	75	74	75	116	102	74	89	76	99	74	108	88	88	74
75	88	175	194	75	166	169	76	75	76	117	103	75	90	77	100	75	109	89	89	75
76	89	176	195	76	167	170	77	76	77	118	104	76	91	78	101	76	110	90	90	76
77	90	177	196	77	168	171	78	77	78	119	105	77	92	79	102	77	111	91	91	77

TABLE SHOWING THE NUMERICAL ORDER ASSIGNED TO THE SONNETS IN VARIOUS REARRANGEMENTS—Continued

O 1609	Benson 1640	Knight 1841	Hugo 1857	Cartwright 1859	Bodenstedt 1862	Bodenstedt 1866	Massey 1866	Massey 1888	Krauss 1872	Velasco y Rojas 1877	Von Mauntz 1894	Butler 1899	Godwin 1900	Slopes 1904	Walsh 1908	Acheson 1922	Fischer 1925	Bray 1925	Bray 1938	Brooke 1936
40	45	35	32	8	48	49	76	39	75	37	111	57	87	64	93	48	109	69	75	37
41	46	36	33	81	49	50	72	35	71	38	24	58	86	63	04	49	110	70	79	37
42	47	37	34	82	50	51	73	36	72	39	25	59	88	65	95	50	111	88	74	38
43	48	38	35	83	51	52	74	37	73	40	26	60	89	66	05	51	112	89	75	39
44	49	39	36	84	52	53	75	38	74	41	27	61	90	67	06	52	113	90	76	40
45	50	40	37	85	53	54	76	39	75	42	28	62	91	68	07	53	114	91	77	41
46	51	41	38	86	54	55	77	40	76	43	29	63	92	69	08	54	115	92	78	42
47	52	42	39	87	55	56	78	41	77	44	30	64	93	70	09	55	116	93	79	43
48	53	43	40	88	56	57	79	42	78	45	31	65	94	71	10	56	117	94	80	44
49	54	44	41	89	57	58	80	43	79	46	32	66	95	72	11	57	118	95	81	45
50	55	45	42	90	58	59	81	44	80	47	33	67	96	73	12	58	119	96	82	46
51	56	46	43	91	59	60	82	45	81	48	34	68	97	74	13	59	120	97	83	47
52	57	47	44	92	60	61	83	46	82	49	35	69	98	75	14	60	121	98	84	48
53	58	48	45	93	61	62	84	47	83	50	36	70	99	76	15	61	122	99	85	49
54	59	49	46	94	62	63	85	48	84	51	37	71	100	77	16	62	123	100	86	50
55	60	50	47	95	63	64	86	49	85	52	38	72	101	78	17	63	124	101	87	51
56	61	51	48	96	64	65	87	50	86	53	39	73	102	79	18	64	125	102	88	52
57	62	52	49	97	65	66	88	51	87	54	40	74	103	80	19	65	126	103	89	53
58	63	53	50	98	66	67	89	52	88	55	41	75	104	81	20	66	127	104	90	54
59	64	54	51	99	67	68	90	53	89	56	42	76	105	82	21	67	128	105	91	55
60	65	55	52	100	68	69	91	54	90	57	43	77	106	83	22	68	129	106	92	56
61	66	56	53	101	69	70	92	55	91	58	44	78	107	84	23	69	130	107	93	57
62	67	57	54	102	70	71	93	56	92	59	45	79	108	85	24	70	131	108	94	58
63	68	58	55	103	71	72	94	57	93	60	46	80	109	86	25	71	132	109	95	59
64	69	59	56	104	72	73	95	58	94	61	47	81	110	87	26	72	133	110	96	60
65	70	60	57	105	73	74	96	59	95	62	48	82	111	88	27	73	134	111	97	61
66	71	61	58	106	74	75	97	60	96	63	49	83	112	89	28	74	135	112	98	62
67	72	62	59	107	75	76	98	61	97	64	50	84	113	90	29	75	136	113	99	63
68	73	63	60	108	76	77	99	62	98	65	51	85	114	91	30	76	137	114	100	64
69	74	64	61	109	77	78	100	63	99	66	52	86	115	92	31	77	138	115	101	65
70	75	65	62	110	78	79	101	64	100	67	53	87	116	93	32	78	139	116	102	66
71	76	66	63	111	79	80	102	65	101	68	54	88	117	94	33	79	140	117	103	67
72	77	67	64	112	80	81	103	66	102	69	55	89	118	95	34	80	141	118	104	68
73	78	68	65	113	81	82	104	67	103	70	56	90	119	96	35	81	142	119	105	69
74	79	69	66	114	82	83	105	68	104	71	57	91	120	97	36	82	143	120	106	70
75	80	70	67	115	83	84	106	69	105	72	58	92	121	98	37	83	144	121	107	71
76	81	71	68	116	84	85	107	70	106	73	59	93	122	99	38	84	145	122	108	72
77	82	72	69	117	85	86	108	71	107	74	60	94	123	100	39	85	146	123	109	73
78	83	73	70	118	86	87	109	72	108	75	61	95	124	101	40	86	147	124	110	74
79	84	74	71	119	87	88	110	73	109	76	62	96	125	102	41	87	148	125	111	75
80	85	75	72	120	88	89	111	74	110	77	63	97	126	103	42	88	149	126	112	76
81	86	76	73	121	89	90	112	75	111	78	64	98	127	104	43	89	150	127	113	77
82	87	77	74	122	90	91	113	76	112	79	65	99	128	105	44	90	151	128	114	78
83	88	78	75	123	91	92	114	77	113	80	66	100	129	106	45	91	152	129	115	79
84	89	79	76	124	92	93	115	78	114	81	67	101	130	107	46	92	153	130	116	80
85	90	80	77	125	93	94	116	79	115	82	68	102	131	108	47	93	154	131	117	81
86	91	81	78	126	94	95	117	80	116	83	69	103	132	109	48	94	155	132	118	82
87	92	82	79	127	95	96	118	81	117	84	70	104	133	110	49	95	156	133	119	83
88	93	83	80	128	96	97	119	82	118	85	71	105	134	111	50	96	157	134	120	84
89	94	84	81	129	97	98	120	83	119	86	72	106	135	112	51	97	158	135	121	85
90	95	85	82	130	98	99	121	84	120	87	73	107	136	113	52	98	159	136	122	86
91	96	86	83	131	99	100	122	85	121	88	74	108	137	114	53	99	160	137	123	87
92	97	87	84	132	100	101	123	86	122	89	75	109	138	115	54	100	161	138	124	88
93	98	88	85	133	101	102	124	87	123	90	76	110	139	116	55	101	162	139	125	89
94	99	89	86	134	102	103	125	88	124	91	77	111	140	117	56	102	163	140	126	90
95	100	90	87	135	103	104	126	89	125	92	78	112	141	118	57	103	164	141	127	91
96	101	91	88	136	104	105	127	90	126	93	79	113	142	119	58	104	165	142	128	92
97	102	92	89	137	105	106	128	91	127	94	80	114	143	120	59	105	166	143	129	93
98	103	93	90	138	106	107	129	92	128	95	81	115	144	121	60	106	167	144	130	94
99	104	94	91	139	107	108	130	93	129	96	82	116	145	122	61	107	168	145	131	95
100	105	95	92	140	108	109	131	94	130	97	83	117	146	123	62	108	169	146	132	96

TABLE SHOWING THE NUMERICAL ORDER ASSIGNED TO THE SONNETS IN VARIOUS REARRANGEMENTS—Continued

Q 1609	Benson 1640	Knight 1841	Hugo 1857	Cartwright 1859	Bodenstedt 1862	Bodenstedt 1866	Massey 1866	Massey 1888	Krauss 1872	Velasco y Rojas 1877	Von Maunitz 1894	Butler 1899	Godwin 1900	Slopes 1904	Walsh 1908	Acheson 1922	Fischer 1925	Bray 1925	Bray 1938	Brooke 1936
79	18	95	99	56	77	18	35	79	34	70	65	99	123	94	136	79	90	54	54	83
80	72	06	101	57	72	73	36	80	35	71	66	100	128	95	141	80	91	53	53	84
81	73	154	147	91	88	89	40	81	120	148	99	101	8	111	83	88	42	44	44	74
82	75	97	102	58	73	74	42	82	41	75	71	102	124	96	138	81	92	56	56	85
83	76	08	103	59	82	75	40	83	39	76	69	103	125	97	139	82	93	50	50	86
84	77	99	104	60	117	121	41	84	40	74	70	104	126	98	137	83	94	50	50	87
85	78	100	105	61	74	76	38	85	37	73	68	105	127	99	142	84	95	51	51	88
86	79	101	106	62	75	77	37	86	36	72	67	106	120	100	140	85	96	52	52	89
87	80	102	107	63	37	78	62	87	93	96	135	107	100	101	147	86	118	126	126	90
88	81	64	90	64	36	37	81	89	81	112	136	108	131	84	86	70	115	76	68	91
89	82	65	91	66	38	38	93	90	94	97	137	109	132	85	87	71	116	77	69	92
90	83	66	92	67	125	39	94	91	95	98	138	110	133	86	88	72	117	115	115	93
91	84	67	93	68	141	144	82	92	82	113	139	111	134	89	84	73	119	2	2	94
92	85	68	94	69	126	145	83	93	83	114	140	112	135	90	89	74	120	72	66	95
93	86	69	95	70	87	148	84	94	84	115	141	113	136	91	103	75	121	71	71	96
94	87	38	82	83	150	151	90	95	86	121	76	114	96	124	105	44	122	117	117	97
95	88	39	83	84	35	36	85	96	88	123	77	115	97	126	106	41	123	70	76	98
96	89	40	84	85	34	35	134	97	88	122	78	116	97	127	107	42	124	71	77	99
97	90	41	85	86	31	31	95	98	96	99	108	117	62	112	54	55	150	80	80	100
98	91	72	86	87	30	32	96	99	97	100	109	118	63	113	58	56	151	82	82	101
99	92	73	87	88	31	32	97	100	98	101	110	119	64	114	59	57	152	84	84	102
100	93	128	88	89	32	33	98	101	100	102	84	120	140	120	116	60	83	55	55	103
101	94	129	89	90	122	126	98	102	100	103	91	121	141	131	117	61	83	55	55	104
102	95	130	90	91	143	127	99	103	101	104	85	122	142	132	118	53	84	83	83	105
103	96	131	91	92	144	146	100	104	102	105	86	123	117	130	122	105	13	40	40	106
104	97	132	92	93	131	132	101	105	102	106	79	124	32	116	122	63	142	88	88	107
105	98	133	93	94	133	135	49	106	105	107	62	125	153	117	120	103	143	57	57	108
106	99	134	94	95	134	136	104	107	105	108	50	126	110	118	7	64	8	99	99	109
107	100	135	95	96	135	137	22	107	21	3	50	127	148	128	128	65	148	97	97	110
108	101	136	96	97	136	138	23	108	125	153	102	128	149	131	128	66	145	101	101	111
109	102	137	97	98	137	139	24	109	106	142	61	129	150	137	121	52	85	108	108	112
110	103	138	98	99	138	140	50	110	107	103	143	130	143	140	68	119	139	122	122	113
111	104	139	99	100	139	141	51	111	108	104	144	131	144	141	70	111	98	118	118	114
112	105	140	100	101	140	142	52	112	109	105	145	132	145	142	67	112	97	112	112	115
113	106	141	101	102	141	143	53	113	110	106	146	133	146	143	68	112	48	105	105	116
114	107	142	102	103	142	144	54	114	111	107	147	134	147	144	69	113	49	106	106	117
115	108	143	103	104	143	145	55	115	112	108	148	135	148	145	70	114	40	95	95	118
116	109	144	104	105	144	146	56	116	113	109	149	136	149	146	71	115	41	110	110	119
117	110	145	105	106	145	147	57	117	114	110	150	137	150	147	72	116	42	111	111	120
118	111	146	106	107	146	148	58	118	115	111	151	138	151	148	73	117	43	112	112	121
119	112	147	107	108	147	149	59	119	116	112	152	139	152	149	74	118	44	113	113	122
120	113	148	108	109	148	150	60	120	117	113	153	140	153	150	75	119	45	114	114	123
121	114	149	109	110	149	151	61	121	118	114	154	141	154	151	76	120	46	115	115	124
122	115	150	110	111	150	152	62	122	119	115	155	142	155	152	77	121	47	116	116	125
123	116	151	111	112	151	153	63	123	120	116	156	143	156	153	78	122	48	117	117	126
124	117	152	112	113	152	154	64	124	121	117	157	144	157	154	79	123	49	118	118	127
125	118	153	113	114	153	155	65	125	122	118	158	145	158	155	80	124	50	119	119	128
126	119	154	114	115	154	156	66	126	123	119	159	146	159	156	81	125	51	120	120	129
127	120	155	115	116	155	157	67	127	124	120	160	147	160	157	82	126	52	121	121	130
128	121	156	116	117	156	158	68	128	125	121	161	148	161	158	83	127	53	122	122	131
129	122	157	117	118	157	159	69	129	126	122	162	149	162	159	84	128	54	123	123	132
130	123	158	118	119	158	160	70	130	127	123	163	150	163	160	85	129	55	124	124	133
131	124	159	119	120	159	161	71	131	128	124	164	151	164	161	86	130	56	125	125	134
132	125	160	120	121	160	162	72	132	129	125	165	152	165	162	87	131	57	126	126	135
133	126	161	121	122	161	163	73	133	130	126	166	153	166	163	88	132	58	127	127	136
134	127	162	122	123	162	164	74	134	131	127	167	154	167	164	89	133	59	128	128	137
135	128	163	123	124	163	165	75	135	132	128	168	155	168	165	90	134	60	129	129	138
136	129	164	124	125	164	166	76	136	133	129	169	156	169	166	91	135	61	130	130	139
137	130	165	125	126	165	167	77	137	134	130	170	157	170	167	92	136	62	131	131	140
138	131	166	126	127	166	168	78	138	135	131	171	158	171	168	93	137	63	132	132	141
139	132	167	127	128	167	169	79	139	136	132	172	159	172	169	94	138	64	133	133	142
140	133	168	128	129	168	170	80	140	137	133	173	160	173	170	95	139	65	134	134	143
141	134	169	129	130	169	171	81	141	138	134	174	161	174	171	96	140	66	135	135	144
142	135	170	130	131	170	172	82	142	139	135	175	162	175	172	97	141	67	136	136	145
143	136	171	131	132	171	173	83	143	140	136	176	163	176	173	98	142	68	137	137	146
144	137	172	132	133	172	174	84	144	141	137	177	164	177	174	99	143	69	138	138	147
145	138	173	133	134	173	175	85	145	142	138	178	165	178	175	100	144	70	139	139	148
146	139	174	134	135	174	176	86	146	143	139	179	166	179	176	101	145	71	140	140	149
147	140	175	135	136	175	177	87	147	144	140	180	167	180	177	102	146	72	141	141	150
148	141	176	136	137	176	178	88	148	145	141	181	168	181	178	103	147	73	142	142	151
149	142	177	137	138	177	179	89	149	146	142	182	169	182	179	104	148	74	143	143	152
150	143	178	138	139	178	180	90	150	147	143	183	170	183	180	105	149	75	144	144	153
151	144	179	139	140	179	181	91	151	148	144	184	171	184	181	106	150	76	145	145	154
152	14																			

TABLE SHOWING THE NUMERICAL ORDER ASSIGNED TO THE SONNETS IN VARIOUS REARRANGEMENTS—Continued

Q 1609	Benson 1640	Knight 1841	Hugo 1857	Cartwright 1859	Bodenstedt 1862	Bodenstedt 1866	Massey 1866	Massey 1888	Krauss 1872	Velasco y Rojas 1877	Von Mauntz 1894	Butler 1899	Godwin 1900	Stopes 1904	Walsh 1908	Acheson 1922	Fischer 1925	Bray 1925	Bray 1938	Brooke 1936
118	107	41	74	98	124	129	111	116	111	108	147	138	147	143	59	117	147	124	124	118
119	108	42	75	99	125	130	112	117	112	109	148	143	102	146	71	110	140	123	123	119
120	109	43	76	100	126	131	113	118	113	110	149	144	98	147	64	111	137	111	111	120
121	110	103	45	101	127	132	114	119	77	106	151	33	53	87	149	114	127	107	107	121
122	111	82	46	102	128	133	115	120	126	107	103	145	7	138	145	112	119	91	91	122
123	112	83	79	103	129	134	116	121	121	108	104	146	150	150	145	113	120	94	94	123
124	113	84	80	104	130	135	117	122	122	109	105	147	151	152	146	114	121	96	96	124
125	114	85	81	105	131	136	118	123	123	110	106	148	152	153	147	115	122	97	97	125
126	115	139	118	106	132	137	119	124	124	111	107	149	3	154	148	116	123	98	98	126
127	116	4	8	107	133	138	120	125	125	112	108	150	67	27	149	117	124	99	99	127
128	117	7	5	108	134	139	121	126	128	113	109	151	68	28	150	118	125	100	100	128
129	118	19	25	109	135	140	122	127	131	114	110	152	75	29	151	119	126	101	101	129
130	119	8	11	110	136	141	123	128	132	115	111	153	84	30	152	120	127	102	102	130
131	120	5	9	111	137	142	124	129	133	116	112	154	85	31	153	121	128	103	103	131
132	121	6	10	112	138	143	125	130	134	117	113	155	86	32	154	122	129	104	104	132
133	122	29	26	113	139	144	126	131	135	118	114	156	87	33	155	123	130	105	105	133
134	123	30	27	114	140	145	127	132	136	119	115	157	88	34	156	124	131	106	106	134
135	124	1	1	115	141	146	128	133	137	120	116	158	89	35	157	125	132	107	107	135
136	125	2	2	116	142	147	129	134	138	121	117	159	90	36	158	126	133	108	108	136
137	126	20	14	117	143	148	130	135	139	122	118	160	91	37	159	127	134	109	109	137
138	127	21	15	118	144	149	131	136	140	123	119	161	92	38	160	128	135	110	110	138
139	128	10	15	119	145	150	132	137	141	124	120	162	93	39	161	129	136	111	111	139
140	129	11	7	120	146	151	133	138	142	125	121	163	94	40	162	130	137	112	112	140
141	130	22	18	121	147	152	134	139	143	126	122	164	95	41	163	131	138	113	113	141
142	131	23	20	122	148	153	135	140	144	127	123	165	96	42	164	132	139	114	114	142
143	132	3	28	123	149	154	136	141	145	128	124	166	97	43	165	133	140	115	115	143
144	133	31	28	124	150	155	137	142	146	129	125	167	98	44	166	134	141	116	116	144
145	134	16	4	125	151	156	138	143	147	130	126	168	99	45	167	135	142	117	117	145
146	135	104	109	126	152	157	139	144	148	131	127	169	100	46	168	136	143	118	118	146
147	136	24	16	127	153	158	140	145	149	132	128	170	101	47	169	137	144	119	119	147
148	137	25	17	128	154	159	141	146	150	133	129	171	102	48	170	138	145	120	120	148
149	138	25	17	129	155	160	142	147	151	134	130	172	103	49	171	139	146	121	121	149
150	139	26	19	130	156	161	143	148	152	135	131	173	104	50	172	140	147	122	122	150
151	140	27	24	131	157	162	144	149	153	136	132	174	105	51	173	141	148	123	123	151
152	141	28	21	132	158	163	145	150	154	137	133	175	106	52	174	142	149	124	124	152
153	142	17	22	133	159	164	146	151	155	138	134	176	107	53	175	143	150	125	125	153
154	143	18	23	134	160	165	147	152	156	139	135	177	108	54	176	144	151	126	126	154

APPENDIX V

THE "SOURCES"

Sh., unlike Lodge, Daniel, Drayton, and the other Elizabethan sonneteers, is not a paradise for source hunters. Though they credit him with a great knowledge of literature, they find it difficult to give chapter and verse, almost impossible to single out French or Italian sonnets that he translated or adapted or English sonnets that he plagiarized. Indeed, in spite of such confident assertions as LEE's (*Life*, 1898, p. 109) that "the thoughts and words of the sonnets of Daniel, Drayton, Watson, Barnabe Barnes, Constable, and Sidney were assimilated" by Sh., many of the alleged sources turn out to be analogs or even mere commonplaces.

Discussion of the English sources goes back to SEWELL (ed. 1725, Preface, p. ix): Sh. "took fire on reading our admirable *Spenser*, who . . . was in all probability the Poet most in Vogue at that time." Sewell reached this impressionistic verdict ("Be it to *Spenser* then that we owe SHAKESPEAR!") only because a sonnet (VIII) in the *P. P.*, 1599, eulogized the *Faery Queen* poet by name. But that lyric was written by Barnfield. GEORGE CHALMERS (*Supplemental Apology*, 1799, pp. 38-51) likewise argued that Sh. was inspired to sonneteering by SPENSER, from whom he copied (p. 43) his "mode of construction," his "topicks," and "even a frequent sameness of expression"; and later writers, like BRANDES (*William Sh.*, 1898, I, 343) sometimes say that 55 and 81 "treat of precisely the same matter" as the *Amoretti*, 69.¹

Sh.'s indebtedness to DANIEL was proclaimed long ago. MALONE (ed. 1780, p. 581) remarked: "In these compositions, Daniel's Sonnets, which were published in 1592, appear to me to have been the model that Shakspeare followed." As twenty-eight of Daniel's sonnets were printed in the surreptitious edition of Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella*, 1591, while the first separate edition of *Delia* came out in 1592, it seems highly probable that Sh. did read and imitate the well-languaged sonneteer, and, if so, the imitation has considerable bearing on the question when Sh.'s sonnets were composed. DRAKE (*Sh. and His Times*, 1817, II, 57) followed Malone in calling Daniel's "the prototype" of Sh.'s. In the former he recognized not only the same metrical structure but also "much of that tissue of abstract thought, and that reiteration of words, which so remarkably distinguish the sonnets of our bard." BOADEN (*On the Sonnets*, 1837, pp. 48-55) also voiced enthusiastic approval, for he looked upon Daniel, a protégé of Sh.'s friend Herbert, as the rival poet. More recent critics, too, have in general been inclined to endorse Malone's statement. Thus DOWDEN (ed. 1881, p. 27) found in *Delia* "close kinship [to Sh.'s sonnets]. The manner is the same, though the master proves himself of tardier imagination and less ardent temper. Diction, imagery, rhymes, and, in sonnets of

¹ The General Index should be consulted for further references to alleged borrowings from or parallels to Spenser and the other writers treated in this section.

like form, versification, distinctly resemble those of Shakspeare. Malone was surely right when he recognized in Daniel the master of Shakspeare as a writer of sonnets. . . . And it is in Daniel that we find sonnet starting from sonnet almost in Shakspeare's manner, only that Daniel often links poem with poem in more formal wise, the last or the penultimate line of one poem supplying the first line of that which immediately follows." ALDEN (*S. P.*, 1917, XIV, 149 f. n.) assents: Sh.'s "sonnets are related with special closeness to Daniel's." The latter "shows the same sense of continuous, progressive composition, and the same freedom in changing and mingling his images," as Sh. As for conceits Sh. stands "closer to Daniel than to Sidney." "The chief influence" on Sh.'s "work would seem" to POOLER (ed. 1918, p. xxxvii) "to have been Daniel's." ADAMS's opinion (*Life*, 1923, pp. 169 f.) is that from *Delia* Sh. "took his form, acquired much of his sugared style, borrowed not a little imagery and thought, echoed occasional phrases, and learned the trick of nicely linking his poems together. . . . Shakespeare chose to give a firmer unity to his cycle by employing the device, exemplified in Petrarch and Sidney, of stringing his sonnets together in episodes reflecting an autobiographical story; and his genius being essentially dramatic, he rendered this story-element more pronounced than did any of his contemporaries, even Sidney. Thus his cycle came to differ from its model in a way that has led scholars to underestimate his really important indebtedness to the *Delia* sequence." A list of parallels in the sonnets of Sh. and Daniel is given by SCOTT (*Sonnets élisabéthains*, 1929, pp. 248-250). She concludes that "the greatest resemblance is in tone and style, in the beauty of isolated lines, in the same graceful and easy movement. The rime scheme is also the same. It is true that the smooth rhythm of Shakespeare's sonnets is not usually found in Daniel, and the latter poet does not possess a view which stretches over a universe of large horizons. Let us, however, leave the differences aside and pay attention to the points of similarity." "The themes Daniel had treated of before Shakespeare belong to Petrarchanism and are found throughout the Renaissance. But the accumulation of parallels, the versification, the themes, some passages which narrowly resemble one another, and the publication in 1591 of some of the sonnets to *Delia* are sufficient, in our opinion, to indicate that Shakespeare knew the work of his predecessor."

Certain scholars present a minority report. GEORGE CHALMERS (*Supplemental Apology*, 1799, pp. 42 f.) objects, "There is between Daniel's Sonnets and Shakspeare's no other Analogy, than the same construction, as Sonnets, and similar topicks, as amatory Verses." According to VON FRIESEN (*Sh.-Studien*, 1874, I, 330 f.), no unbiased critic can detect any great influence of Daniel in the sonnets; the structure is the same, but it goes back to Wyatt and Surrey in 1557. CONRAD (*Jahrbuch*, 1882, XVII, 196) also protests "that the sonnet form used by Shakespeare came into existence with the beginning of sonneteering about the middle of the century and was popular from the start; that at the time when sonnets flourished, toward the end of the century, it was used most frequently; that, therefore, Shakespeare had no need of Daniel's example in order to write in that form." Conrad disposed of Daniel's influence on chronological grounds (p. 167): "If it is *just* as probable that many of our poet's sonnets were composed *before* 1592 as it is that he wrote plays before

this date, with what justification may one then assert that *Shakespeare* used, for his own purpose, Daniel's sonnets which were circulating in manuscript? Why should not the contrary have been the case?" Possibly "unconscious reminiscences of Daniel" (pp. 174 f.) are to be acknowledged in 89, 96, 142, but these are late sonnets. Any assertion that Sh. consciously took Daniel for his model belongs (p. 169) to the region of "pure speculation." One is (p. 200) "not justified in speaking of a *model* for a poet who, in his mature lyrics of friendship and meditation, stands as a *creator, on a solitary height*." MARTHA F. CROW (*Elizabethan Sonnet-Cycles* [Daniel], 1896, pp. 3-5), too, denies any real borrowing by Sh. The similarity of conceits and ideas in all the Elizabethan sonneteers is, she urges, due to Petrarchan influence; and there is no evidence that Daniel influenced Sh. to use the English form of the sonnet.

MASSEY (ed. 1866, pp. 36-39), the first to emphasize Sh.'s debt to SIDNEY's *Arcadia*, 1590, quotes from book III, chapter 5 (1912 ed., I, 379 f.), the arguments Cecropia addressed to Philoclea "in favour of marriage and children": "No, no, my deere neece, Nature, when you were first borne, vowed you a womā, & as *she made you child of a mother, so to do your best to be mother of a child: she gave you beautie to move love; she gave you wit to know love; she gave you an excellēt body to reward love: which kind of liberall rewarding is crowned with unspeakable felicitie*. For this, as it bindeth the receiver, *so it makes happy the bestower: this doth not impoverish, but enrich the giver*. O the sweet name of a mother: O the cōfort of cōforts, to see your childrē grow up, *in whō you are (as it were) eternized: if you could conceive what a hart-tickling joy it is to see your own litle ones, with awfull love come running to your lap, and like litle models of your selfe, still cary you about them, you would thinke unkindnes in your own thoughts, that ever they did rebell against the mean unto it. . . . I know not (answered the sweet Philoclea, fearing least silence would offend her sul-lennes) what contentment you speake of: but I am sure the best you can make of it, (which is mariage) is a burdenous yoke*. Ah, deer neece (said *Cecropia*) how much you are deceived? A yoke indeed we all beare, laid upō us in our creation, which by mariage is not increased, but thus farre eased, that you have a yoke-fellow to help to draw through the cloddy cumbers of this world. O widow-nights, beare witnes with me of the difference. How often alas do I embrace the orfan-side of my bed, which was wōt to be imprinted by the body of my deare husband, & with teares acknowledge, that I now enjoy such a liberty as the banished mā hath; who may, if he list, wāder over the world, but is ever restrained frō his most delightful home? that I have now such a liberty as the seeled dov hath, which being first deprived of eies, is then by the falconer cast off? For beleve me, neece, beleve me, mans experiēce is womās best eie-sight. *Have you ever seene a pure Rosewater kept in a christal glas; how fine it lokes, how sweet it smels, while that beautifull glasse imprisons it? Breake the prison, and let the water take his owne course, doth it not imbrace dust, and loose all his former sweetnesse, and fairenesse? Truly so are we, if we have not the stay, rather then the restraint of Cristalline mariage*. My hart meltes to thinke of the sweete confortes, I in that happie time received, when I had never cause to care, but the care was doubled: whē I never rejoiced, but that I saw my joy shine in anothers eies. What shall I say of the

free delight, which the hart might embrace, without the accusing of the inward conscience, or feare of outward shame? and is a solitary life as good as this? *then can one string make as good musicke as a consort*: thē can one colour set forth a beautie." In this extract I have italicized the words Massey finds especially significant. With it he compares especially lines and ideas in 5, 6, 8-11, 13 (p. 37): "All these are in that brief passage of Sidney's prose, and all are used for the same purpose, the main difference being that in the 'Arcadia' it is a woman speaking to a woman." Sh.'s (p. 39) "is a kind of unconscious plagiarism only possible to the young and immature mind; the effect of a first acquaintanceship, and the warm affection felt for a new work. A careful study of the 'Arcadia' will reveal how greatly Shakspeare must have loved the book, and how deeply its influence dyed his mind."

Taking Massey for his guide, KRAUSS (*Nord und Süd*, 1879, VIII, 234 f.) proceeded to give elaborate further details about Sh.'s indebtedness to the *Arcadia*. For example, with 5, 9, 12, 19 he compares book III, chapter 10 (1912 ed., I, 405), "for Beauty goes away, devoured by Time, but where remains it ever flourishing, but in the hart of a true lover? And such a one (if ever there were any) is my son"; and with 1, 3, 6, 16 the same, "do you enjoy the heaven of your age, whereof you are sure: and like good housholders, which spend those thinges that will not be kept, so do you pleasantly enjoy that, which else will bring an over-late repentance, whē your glas shall accuse you to your face, what a change there is in you. Do you see how the spring-time is ful of flowers, decking it self with them, & not aspiring to the fruits of *Autumn*? what lesson is that unto you, but that in the april of your age, you should be like *April*?" From the eclogues at the end of book I (1912 ed., I, 139 f.) he directed attention to the song of Geron to *Histor* and its similarities with the "procreation sonnets":

Nature above all things requireth this,
That we our kind doo labour to maintaine;
Which drawne-out line doth hold all humane blisse.
Thy father justly may of thee complaine,
If thou doo not repay his deeds for thee,
In granting unto him a grandsires gaine.
Thy common-wealth may rightly grieved be,
Which must by this immortall be preserved,
If thus thou murder thy posteritie.
His very being he hath not deserved,
Who for a selfe-concept will that forbear,
Whereby that being aye must be conserved. . . .
O *Histor*, seeke within thy selfe to flourish:
Thy house by thee must live, or els be gone:
And then who shall the name of *Histor* nourish?
Riches of children passe a Princes throne;
Which touch the fathers hart with secret joy,
When without shame he saith, these be mine owne.
Marrie therefore; for marriage will destroy
Those passions which to youthfull head doo clime
Mothers and Nurses of all vaine annoy.

KRAUSS repeated all his *Arcadia* references in 1881 (*Jahrbuch*, XVI, 146-149), but to them added (pp. 174-204) abundant citations of parallels or borrowings in the sonnets (like 21, 38, 76, 84, 129, and 146) from *Astrophel and Stella*, 1591, a book to which CARTWRIGHT in 1863 (*Papers on Sh.*, 1877, p. 18) had said that "many" of Sh.'s lyrics were indebted. He believed that "The fifth Sonnet" appended to Sidney's sequence (1922 ed., II, 290-292) "perhaps not only evoked" 130, but also provided "the basic thought of the whole series of Herbert-sonnets"—57, 58, 127-132, 135-143, 145-154 (see p. 90, above).

To this subject MASSEY (ed. 1888, pp. 71-78) himself returned, giving details about borrowings from the *Arcadia* in 1-17 and from *Astrophel and Stella* in 14 and later sonnets. In the case of the novel the parallels are often close in idea and wording; those from the sonnet sequence (see the notes to 14, 27, 43, 50, 61, 132, 139, 142), though not so clear, are interesting. As a result the *Arcadia* is usually regarded an undoubted source-book for at least some of the early sonnets; as by POOLER (ed. 1918, p. xxxvii). GREENLAW (*S. P.*, 1916, XIII, 135) repeated Krauss's view that the song of Geron parallels 1-17 "so closely as to render it practically certain that Shakespeare had it in mind. In this song a shepherd urges a youth to marry in order to beget children and so gain an earthly immortality. The situation is precisely similar to that of the sonnets, and the correspondences in thought and expression are very close." SCOTT (*Sonnets élisabéthains*, 1929, p. 251) perhaps summarizes current opinion when she says that Sidney's influence on Sh. is "certain," though that exerted by *Astrophel and Stella* has been much exaggerated by BRANDL (*Sh.'s Sonette*, 1913, pp. xxxi-xxxiii).

Whether Sh. imitated DRAYTON or Drayton Sh. was long a topic for warm debate. TYLER (ed. 1890, pp. 38-43) detected no resemblances with Sh. in *Ideas Mirrour*, 1594, but many in *Idea*, 1599. He concluded that Drayton had read Sh.'s sonnets in manuscript,—in 1598 Meres had referred to them as circulating among the author's friends,—and that he applied "their Shakespearian colouring" to his own "during the interval." Perhaps FLEAY (*Biographical Chronicle*, 1891, II, 226-231) had not seen Tyler's discussion. At any rate, after listing a great many supposed resemblances, he announced (p. 230) that Sh. "had specially in view" the sonnets of Drayton. Sh. "has at least three corresponding passages with him for one with any other writer; and the likeness is much closer, especially in those parts of Drayton which are most removed from commonplace. . . . Hardly a stanza of Drayton has been left unused by Shakespeare." It is impossible to accept Fleay's sweeping generalizations because of the inaccuracy with which he handled dates and editions. Apparently he thought that all Drayton's sonnets were published in 1594, whereas many were added in later years. According to KATHLEEN TILLOTSON (Drayton, 1941 ed., p. 15): "*Ideas Mirrour* [1594] was progressively purged; twenty-one sonnets reappear in no later edition; of the rest, one was rejected in 1600, three in 1605, and seven in 1619; so that only twenty of its fifty-three sonnets are to be found in the definitive edition [of 1619]." In regard to the 1619 edition (p. 137): "Twenty of its sonnets date from 1594, nineteen from 1599, seven from 1600, one from 1602, and seven from 1605, the remaining ten first appearing in 1619."

To GOLLANCZ (ed. 1896, p. xxiii n.) "it seems most likely that Drayton [in

Idea, 1599] was the borrower." In the opinion of WYNDHAM (ed. 1898, pp. 256-258), "the case against Fleay is overwhelming"; for a number of the Drayton sonnets which he accuses Sh. of imitating do not occur in the 1594 and 1599 texts but make their first appearance in 1619. (As BEECHING [ed. 1904, p. 138] observes, Wyndham himself is not always accurate in assigning Drayton's sonnets to the proper editions.) Furthermore, "Drayton was condemned for a plagiary even in 1598 in Guilpin's *Skialetheia*," sig. E1^v, where we read, "*Drayton's* condemn'd of some for imitation, But others say t'was the best Poets fashion."¹ Wyndham reprints from the 1619 edition Drayton's 44 (it is sonnet 43 in the 1599 edition)—"Whilst thus my pen striues to eternize thee"—which "'eternizes' in Shakespeare's very accent"; and quotes part of sonnet 1—"Like an aduenturous Sea-farer am I . . . call'd to tell of his Discouerie, How farre he sayl'd, what Countries he had seene"—with which he compares 80 and 86. "Shakespeare dwells on the simplicity of his verse; on the 'false art,' 'strainèd touches,' 'false painting,' and 'precious phrase,' of the Rival; and Drayton boasts 'fantasticklie I sing' (1599 [sonnet 2]), and asks (ix. 1619 [really sonnet 12, 1602]):

'Why in this sort I wrest Inuention so,
And why these giddy metaphors I vse. . . .'

Considering exactly the same evidence, LEE (*Life*, 1898, p. 110) rendered a verdict for Fleay: to Drayton Sh. "was especially indebted." "The whole of Drayton's century of sonnets except twelve," he added, "were in print long before 1609, and it could easily be shown that the earliest fifty-three published in 1594 supply as close parallels with Shakespeare's sonnets as any of the forty-seven published subsequently. Internal evidence suggests that all but one or two of Drayton's sonnets were written by him in 1594." Besides, "almost all" of them were "doubtless" circulating in manuscript in 1594, though long held back from publication. These are assertions—some of them inexact—and not proofs. They were promptly refuted by BEECHING (ed. 1904, pp. 132-139). He doubts that "any poet could exercise any such self-repression" as to write all his sonnets before 1594 and keep back many till 1605 and 1619. "Even if additions might be accounted for on this heroic theory, it would hardly cover substitutions. Five years after Drayton's first batch of sonnets appeared, he suppressed twenty of them and added thirty others. Surely the right conclusion is the obvious one, that these new sonnets were written during the interval, and seemed to the poet better than those which they replaced." As for internal evidence, the one sonnet (51, "Calling to minde since first my loue begunne") bearing "its date on its face" refers to the accession of James and "was printed without delay in the 1605 collection." In opposition to Lee, Beeching argues "that internal evidence rather suggests that the order of the publication" of Drayton's sonnets "was the actual order of their writing. . . . Drayton began to write sonnets in the manner of Daniel; then he passed from this style to that of Sidney; finally he adopted, so far as he could, the style of Shakespeare." Comparing Drayton's first sonnet (1594), "Reade heer (sweet Mayd) the story of my woe," with Daniel's

¹ Earlier noticed by TYLER (ed. 1890, p. 43).

thirty-ninth (1592), "Reade in my face, a volume of despayres," Beeching concludes: "As Daniel has by three years the advantage in date of publication, Drayton must be held the copyist." Sidney is the model of the 1599 volume, in which many of the earlier sonnets are omitted and thirty added.¹ Sh.'s influence "is already discernible in one or two sonnets of the 1599 volume, . . . but in the sonnets of 1605 and 1619 it is the paramount influence." Though Q was not published till 1609, "surely Shakespeare's manuscript would have been as accessible to Drayton as (according to Mr. Lee) Drayton's was to Shakespeare." Beeching is content to rest his case on the ground of style, which seems to him conclusive evidence that Sh. was the master, Drayton the disciple and borrower.

His arguments were favorably regarded by O. ELTON (*Michael Drayton*, 1905, pp. 56-58): "The question which of the two was the lender is insoluble," but "the passages in Drayton . . . , which we have learnt to call Shakespearean, hardly begin till his editions of 1599 or 1602," and "it is natural to think that Drayton . . . early caught some deep accents and noble rhythms from Shakespeare's poems, which he, like others, may have seen unprinted." POOLER (ed. 1918, p. xxxviii) is "disposed to accept" Beeching's views. Even LEE seems to have been converted, for in the 1915 *Life* he soft-pedals Drayton, citing him occasionally for parallels, but omitting him (p. 178) from the list of "native contemporaries" to whom Sh. is said to be indebted. The most recent and authoritative pronouncement is that of KATHLEEN TILLOTSON (*Drayton*, 1941 ed., V, 138 n.): "My own view is that the specific parallels [as in my notes to 46, 63, 81, 107, 141, 144] have been overpressed, but that Shakespeare had a strong general influence on D[rayton]." Drayton's 1605 sonnets she describes (p. 139) as "peculiarly Shakespearean. Three sonnets (47, 51, 58) have Shakespearean themes, two others (43, 57) recall his style, although none are closely imitative."

RICHARD BARNFIELD's name was presented long ago. DELIUS (*Jahrbuch*, 1865, I, 32), for example, referred to the sonnets as an analog of Barnfield's *Affectionate Shepherd*, 1594. This notion was restated by W. C. HAZLITT in 1902 (*Shakespeare*, pp. 206 f.). POOLER (ed. 1918, pp. xxxv f.) supplied details: in the sonnets to his male friend Sh. was perhaps "taking a hint from Barnfield's *Affectionate Shepherd*. In the person of the shepherd, Daphnis, Barnfield praises the beauty of the boy Ganymede, warns him that this beauty is perishable, declares his love for him, and laments that he has a rival in a woman whose love is light. Moreover, he advises him to marry, warns him against profligacy, expatiates on the courtier's fawning for his prince's favour, and on change and decay. . . . And he is even more emphatic than Shakespeare in asserting that his own years are past the best . . . [though he] was about 20. . . . There are practically no resemblances of phrase or rhythm." Pooler thought that Barnfield was not the borrower: if he had known the sonnets in manuscript, he "would probably have quoted from them freely, as he did from *Venus*."

A few other English sources have been suggested. To mention a detail of

¹ Beeching (p. 135 n.) confesses to being "ill at these numbers," but I let them pass.

the sort I have usually confined only to the notes, LEE (*Life*, 1898, p. 113 n.) asserts that 153 has a conceit taken from GILES FLETCHER's *Licia*, 1593. He indulges in more unpersuasive assertions (pp. 121, 152 n.) designed to crown BARNABE BARNES as the rival poet, and to show that he influenced the subject and phraseology of Sh.'s "vituperative" sonnets to the dark woman. SCOTT (*Sonnets élisabéthains*, 1929, p. 258 n.) dismisses Lee's assumptions as of no interest; but, she admits (pp. 256-258), parallels in 24, 99, and 106 to *Diana*, 1592, indicate that Sh. drew some material from another of Lee's candidates, HENRY CONSTABLE. Borrowings in 46 and 47 from WATSON's *Tears of Fancy* (published 1593) have also been argued for by BRANDES (*William Sh.*, 1898, I, 343), LEE (*Life*, 1898, pp. 112 f.), and others. See further the notes to 42.

As for MARLOWE, in 1884 CONRAD (*Jahrbuch*, XIX, 248-251) assembled a number of similar passages from *Hero and Leander* and the sonnets, and professed an inclination to regard Marlowe as the borrower. EWIG's conclusions (*Anglia*, 1899, XXII, 450) were: "We find in *Hero and Leander* a number of thoughts out of Shakespeare's 'procreation' sonnets . . . and indeed in so remarkably similar a form that the assumption of an intimate connection is inescapable. Apparently Marlowe is the borrower. . . . The similarities between Marlowe and Shakespeare do not rest at all upon common borrowing [from Sidney and Daniel]. In Marlowe we find ideas which Sh. [*sic*] brings in independently of Daniel and Sidney. There remains, therefore, only the assumption of Marlowe's dependence upon our poet." ANDERS (*Sh.'s Books*, 1904, p. 96), however, more reasonably assigned the role of borrower to Sh.:¹ "procreation-arguments" in *Hero and Leander* (especially I, 317 ff.) "struck the fancy of the young Shakespeare," and became "the theme of many sonnets." MASSEY had earlier referred the theme to Sidney's treatment of it, and later FRIPP (*Shakespeare*, 1938, I, 267) described it as lifted into 2, 3, 9, 12, 13 from THOMAS WILSON's *Arte of Rhetorique*, 1553. SCOTT (*Sonnets élisabéthains*, 1929, pp. 259-262) stresses the resemblance between the sonnets and Marlowe's poem, but, as the dates of composition of both are unknown, she leaves uncertain who the borrower was.

LYLY is sometimes credited with influence on the sonnets, as by HENSE (*Shakespeare*, 1884, pp. 125 f.). "The story of the two friends, one of whom robs the other of his mistress," BRANDES (*William Sh.*, 1898, I, 343) says, is taken from *Euphues*, 1578. BRANDL (*Sh.'s Sonette*, 1913, pp. xi f.) also stresses the similarity of the story in 18-43 to that of the novel. "Thè pains" Sh. "suffers during the absence of his friend," HANS KLIEM (*Sentimentale Freundschaft*, 1915, p. 40) writes, "the affection ever-increasing because of the separation, the reproaches because the friend in the poet's absence has sought the favor of the poet's mistress, these are ideas which are found . . . in *Euphues* and in *Arcadia*." The triangle plot is old and eternal; none the less, HELENE RICHTER (*Sh. der Mensch*, 1923, p. 66) insists that *Euphues* is definitely the source of 127-152. Meanwhile, GLEICHEN-RUSSWURM (*Freundschaft*, 1911, p. 198) had professed to see borrowings from Lyly's play, *Campaspe* (published 1584): "Alexander the Great and the painter Apelles are friends. Their relations are disturbed when Apelles falls in love with the king's mistress while he is painting her. But Alexander conquers his feelings for the beautiful captive

¹ SANFELICE (*Sh.'s 154 sonetti*, 1898, p. 22) also had this opinion.

and resigns her in favor of his friend. A similar psychological development takes place in Shakespeare's sonnet drama. The poet looks upon the woman who entices him as his evil genius; he regards the friend for whom he sacrifices this sensual passion as his good angel. In the sonnets he dedicates to his idol love without end, eternal friendship, a devotion which knows no bounds." According to TUCKER (ed. 1924, pp. lxxix f.) "no one doubts" that Sh. used both Lyly's novels, and he gives numerous examples of what appear to be borrowings. SCOTT (*Sonnets élisabéthains*, 1929, pp. 262 f.), too, lists expressions in the sonnets that are close in wording to Lyly (see the notes to 24.2, 35.4, 46, 73, 121); they are more or less commonplaces, yet she has no doubt that Sh.'s style was fashioned with Lyly's aid.

In 1916 (*T. L. S.*, June 22, pp. 297 f.) and then at more length in his book, *Chaucer & the Rival Poet*, 1921, ORD called attention (p. 11) to "striking verbal resemblances" between the sonnets and CHAUCER, particularly in the *Romaunt of the Rose*. He enumerates "resemblances between Chaucer's and Shakespeare's theory of life" (pp. 23-30), "resemblances of incident" (pp. 31-37), and "minor verbal resemblances" (pp. 52-56). For example (p. 23), 1.1 f. seems "immediately to refer to the main lesson of the *Roman*—that inculcated by 'Reason': *i. e.* the aim of Nature in love:

'From fairest creatures we desire increase,
That thereby beauty's *Rose* might never die,'

and the probability of the thought being borrowed from the *Roman* is still more strongly impressed" by the italics of *Rose*. Ord professes (p. 64) to have made his thesis "clear without doubt." It was accepted by E. M. NANCARROW (*T. L. S.*, June 29, 1916, p. 310), who suggested that Sh. was responsible for the 1597 "modernized" edition of Chaucer and cites 76.11, "So all my best is dressing old words new." Most other people will feel that considerable doubts remain.

Nobody, however, denies Sh. a pretty close familiarity with the BIBLE.¹ Details are given here and there in the notes (for example, those to 57, 74, 112, 121), but mention may be made of PHILLIPS (*Sunlight on Sh.'s Sonnets*, 1935). Wearing his rue with an Oxfordian difference, he designates a number of Biblical references; as (pp. 146, 117, 159) in 40 to II Samuel xii and in 95 to Matthew xii.44; while 146 "is on the theme of I Corinthians xv.54."

The alleged foreign sources of the sonnets have caused even more dispute than the English. With this dispute Lee's name is prominently associated. "Such resemblances as are visible between Shakespeare's sonnets and those of Petrarch or Desportes," LEE (*Life*, 1898, pp. 110-112) declared, "seem due to his study of the English imitators of those sonnetteers [*sic*]. Most of Ronsard's . . . sonnets and many of his numerous odes were accessible to Shakespeare in English adaptations, but there are a few signs that Shakespeare had

¹ HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS (*Attempt to Discover Which Version of the Bible*, etc., 1867, p. 5), without mentioning the sonnets, decided that Sh. "usually read" the Geneva Bible. RICHMOND NOBLE (*Sh.'s Biblical Knowledge*, 1935, p. 58) says, "It is beyond all shadow of doubt" that Sh. used the Geneva and the Bishops' Bibles as well as the Prayer Book, but he, too, confines his examination to the plays.

recourse to Ronsard direct."¹ For example, 24 "develops Ronsard's conceit that his love's portrait is painted on his heart," 122 "repeats something of Ronsard's phraseology."² Further (p. 122), in Etienne Jodelle's vituperative sonnets "Contr' amours" "there is sufficient identity of tone" (see the notes to 47, 62, 127, 144) with Sh.'s attacks on the dark woman "almost to discover in Shakespeare's invectives a spark of Jodelle's satiric fire." In a later discussion (*French Renaissance*, 1910, pp. 266-276) LEE emphasized apparent borrowings from RONSARD, VAUQUELIN DE LA FRESNAIE, AMADIS JAMYN, DESPORTES, and JODELLE (see the notes to 44, 73, 104, 144), giving readers the impression that Sh. made heavy inroads on "the less known French poets." Again in 1915 (*Life*, p. 212) LEE wrote: "To a noble patron, Comte de Fauquemerge et de Courtenay, Jodelle addressed [in 1574] a series of eight sonnets which anticipate Shakespeare's sonnets at every turn." But the illustrations he gives hardly support the theory that there was actual borrowing on Sh.'s part. They are commonplaces of Renaissance sonneteering. All this overemphasis—though as analogs his examples are valuable—was caused by Lee's deep-rooted conviction that Sh.'s, and nearly every other sixteenth-century poet's, sonnets were conventional and artificial, not sincere or autobiographical expressions.

Presumably his ideas appealed to JOSEPH VIANEY, who expatiates (*Pétrarquisme en France*, 1909) on the continual efforts nearly all French sonneteers made to imitate the subject-matter of the Italians. On the contrary, A. H. UPHAM (*French Influence*, 1908, p. 139) believes that "inspiration" for Sh.'s sonnets "probably came from various directions, but there are no means available by which his indebtedness can be traced." E. S. BATES (*M. P.*, 1910, VIII, 87-106), too, repudiating Lee's theory that the sonnets are thoroughly conventional and hence insincere, expresses surprize (pp. 102 f.) to find "conventional ideas and conceits as few as they are." It is not "by the absence of the conventional but by the presence of the unconventional that the individuality" of Sh. is marked. His un-Petrarchan attacks on the dark woman, for example, have no connection with Lee's "alleged parallelisms from poems of Ronsard and others calling their mistresses 'tigresses' and 'Medusas' because of their hard hearts . . . since these remonstrances are caused by the immovable chastity of the mistress, while in Shakespeare they are caused by her fickle unchastity. Most striking of all Shakespeare's unconventionalities is his emphasis upon mutuality of love." Lee's parallels are assailed from another angle by SCOTT (*Sonnets élisabéthains*, 1929, pp. 241-247), who cannot believe that Sh. knew anything about such writers as DE LA FRESNAIE, JODELLE, or JAMYN, the first two of whom were not popular even in France. She

¹ ERNST VOEGE (*Mittelbarkeit . . . in der Lyrik*, 1932, p. 114), on the contrary, declares that Sh. "learned not only from his numerous sonnet-writing countrymen but from the great Ronsard, whose voluminous, diverse lyric output represents a rich pattern of mediate lyric poetry." He finds in Sh., however, "characteristics of a specifically Germanic coinage."

² M. I. BAYM (*S. A. B.*, 1937, XII, 155-158) deduces from 2, 12, 32, 71, 72 that Sh. "may very well have read the *Amours* of Ronsard." See also the notes to 100 and 104.

denies that Sh. imitated or paraphrased the French sonneteers: he merely used the ordinary ideas and subjects popular in his day.

The notion that Sh.'s sonnets, whatever their exact source, are essentially PETRARCHAN was emphasized by IRENE ZOCCO (*Petrarchismo*, 1906), KAUN (*Konventionelles in den Elisabethanischen Sonetten*, 1915), and by WOLFF (*E. S.*, 1916, L, 152-164).¹ Zocco (pp. 108-111) sees shopworn Petrarchan conceits and motifs in a number, as 1, 40, 43, 50, 70, 75, 135, 136, 139, 143; in others (12, 19, 60, 92, 93, 97) Sh.'s genius has transformed them; and in still others (as 29-31, 36, 39, 90, 112, 116) they have totally vanished. Wolff (see also p. 240, below), far more persuasively than Lee, says (pp. 157 f., 161) that sonnets to a beautiful male friend were written in Italy by Sannazaro, Michelangelo, Alamanni, and Francesco Copetta and in England by Barnfield; while Tasso, Michelangelo, Ronsard, and others wrote of love for dark women—women whose attractions had to differ from those of the usual blonde if the love described was not to be *amor razionale*. These women are insulted by the poets as the incarnation of *amor sensuale*. The Petrarchanism of Michelangelo and Sh. is a living power, not merely a fashion; it formed a high ideal, but resulted in leaving almost no room for subjective expression or for the poet's personal experiences. Sh.'s sorrows and complaints are stereotyped; the people in his sonnets may have existed, but the pictures that present them are conventional. In a later work (*Renaissance in der englischen Literatur*, 1928, p. 77) WOLFF says that every theme in the sonnets can be found in the Italians, and if Sh., more independent than his predecessors, hardly ever translated a foreign poem more or less literally, the fact is probably attributable to his meager knowledge of Italian, which forced him into an originality regarded by contemporary sonneteers as neither an advantage nor a necessity. Because of Sh.'s inability to translate Italian accurately most of his sonnets bear strongly his own spiritual impress. Wolff's views and his parallels are extremely interesting and valuable. Even the most determined opponent of his arguments will admit their apparent plausibility.

His steps were partly followed by HASSELKUSS (*Petrarkismus*, 1927, pp. 79, 236), who says that Sh. made masterly use of traditional material, but refused to imitate the PETRARCHANS "in every direction." In particular, he abjured "Petrarchan locutions; he forgot 'the perfect ceremony of love's rite' (23.6). He likes to express himself in 'true-plain words' (82.12); nor does he search for new-found methods and compounds strange; he knows his own powers (76.11 f.). . . . He wants to know nothing of dreamy Petrarchan idealism, which revels in hyperbole; he rejects the most popular, constantly repeated similes (130)." SCOTT (*Sonnets élisabéthains*, 1929, pp. 237-241), while admitting that Wolff's general ideas are just, criticizes certain details. Her main objection is that, by his omissions, he makes the similarities between the Italian and English sonnets appear greater than they really are. He says, for example, that some of Tasso's sonnets closely resemble Sh.'s "procreation" series. But Scott finds that one of these was addressed to a woman, Leonora

¹ BORGHESI (*Petrarch and His Influence*, 1906, pp. 106-113) discussed this subject, but designated only 21, 23, and 26 as showing Petrarchan influence. For an alleged direct Petrarchan source see the notes to 110.

Sanvitale, "who *had just had a daughter*," whereas "the sonnets of Shakespeare belong in the domain of the imagination." In sonnets by Giovanni della Casa to Antonio Soranzo, Wolff sees the same tone of idolatry that exists in some of Sh.'s addresses to his patron, but Soranzo was dead! Scott also disapproves of Wolff's attempt to liken the rival-poet sonnets to the poems of self-depreciation written by the Italian sonneteers. She concludes: "We agree in admitting a common stock for all the sonnets of the Renaissance, a resemblance more or less great depending upon the circumstances of the poets. One can enumerate Petrarchan and anti-Petrarchan themes in all. In this sense one can say that Shakespeare's sonnets resemble the Italian sonnets. For my part, however, I confess I have read numerous Italian anthologies without having once run across a striking analogy. There are, of course, similar themes, but here it is necessary not to exaggerate for fear of falling into worse errors."¹

Undeterred by Scott's censures, WOLFF in 1931 (*E. S.*, LXVI, 265-268) reiterated his old beliefs. The Elizabethan sonneteers tried to be as much like Italian and French models as possible, and in general their success depended on how closely they imitated. Their sonnets bear a conventional-social, not a personal, imprint, for they are expressions of a mood that was common property. Sh., of course, was a great genius who could not plagiarize even if he wished to. Often he writes obscurely, but so did many other sonneteers. The obscurity is a natural derivative of the Platonic mysticism inherent in Petrarchan theory, not a device to mask some great secret. An inner compulsion, not a mere desire to imitate, impelled Renaissance writers to copy their predecessors. The artistic originality of Sh.'s sonnets needs no apology, but there is little material originality, even if one insists on reading mysterious, autobiographical meanings into certain dark passages.

The united efforts of Lee and Wolff have carried conviction to some critics—like GAEHDE (*Sh. und seine Zeit*, 1931, p. 17) and PEARSON (*Elizabethan Love Conventions*, 1933, pp. 252-258). They have proved Sh.'s sonnets to contain a large amount of conventional ideas, images, expressions; but, as Bates and others have remarked, it does not necessarily follow that sincerity and autobiography are therefore to be dismissed from consideration.

A few other modern foreign "sources" have had occasional advocates. An anonymous writer in 1884-1886 (*Blackwood's*, CXXXV, 727-761, CXXXVII, 774-800, CXXXIX, 327-350) asserted (p. 349) that "many" of the sonnets contain "vestiges of Dante," an assertion ill-supported by the "parallels" he gives. All (like those he cites from St. Augustine, Sh.'s "greatest teacher" [p. 784]) turn out to have an accidental, or incidental, resemblance to Sh.² Nothing more can be said for the statement of SACHS (*Jahrbuch*, 1890, XXV, 148) that Tasso "through his love sonnets became Shakespeare's direct model." DANTE and TASSO have even been presented as candidates for the rival poet (see pp. 288-290, below), but nobody now takes them seriously.

¹ ARTURO FARINELLI (*Jahrbuch*, 1939, LXXV, 23 f.) "would like to exclude every influence of Italy and . . . Platonism . . . in the magical and mysterious sonnet cycle of Shakespeare. . . . What a surprise if this mighty man had received . . . the slightest hint of the Platonic ideas of Michelangelo."

² See also p. 390, below.

More widely discussed is the question: Do the sonnets reveal traces of the philosophy of GIORDANO BRUNO? KÖNIG (*Jahrbuch*, 1876, XI, 97-139) made the first separate study of Bruno and Sh. "Bruno's doctrine of the atom," he says (p. 114), "results directly in the assertion . . . that all existing things have been here long since, that no thing vanishes completely, but only changes its place and its relationships and makes way for other bodies, so that nothing at all continues in the same state," and Sh. reproduces these ideas in 59.1 and 60.3. In his sonnets "we find numerous expressions in which individuality, physical as well as spiritual, seems to be thought of, wholly in Bruno's sense, as determined by composition," as 45.9, 53.1, 59.10, 71.10, 81.4, and 89.6. "A particularly interesting agreement" (p. 120) occurs in the pronouncements of the two writers on "the sudden change of character from good to evil" (94.11-13). Also in the sonnets of both (pp. 136 f.) "there is a kinship of matter as well as a similarity of single thoughts and expressions." König quotes Bruno's sonnets "Ahi, qual condizion, natura, o sorte" and "Oimè che son constretto dal furore" (*De Gl' Heroici Furori*, ed. F. Flora, 1928, pp. 52, 63 f.), and points to their resemblances with 126, 129, 137, 144, 145, 147, and 148. In particular "Oimè che son constretto" shows "a striking agreement" with 126 in that it "has but twelve lines, though the rime scheme is somewhat different in the two"; and another common irregularity of Bruno's sonnets is duplicated in 145, which is in tetrameter, not pentameter, verse.

König was promptly challenged by ROBERT BEYERSDORFF (*Giordano Bruno und Sh.*, 1889, pp. 34-36): "No real atomistic-materialistic theory underlies those Shakespearean passages [cited by König]. They are explained by the popular medical conception of the time that all characteristics of temperament depend upon the bodily constitution, upon the mixture of the humors, and that certain passions dwell in individual organs, as, for example, in the spleen, gall-bladder, liver and so on. Yet the nature of character need not therefore be misunderstood as materialistic. . . . We would regard it actually as an imperfection if Shakespeare did not have a keen eye for good and bad motives, which often enough lie close together. . . . None the less, he has been considered dependent upon Bruno here as well, and there have been attempts to derive his deep understanding for the delicate transitions in moral matters from Bruno's doctrine of the coincidence of contrasts in nature and in the ethical world." Bruno himself derived this doctrine from Nicholas Cusanus, and it is found in Montaigne. "The axiom of the coincidence of contrasts is bound in such a manner with Lyly's whole thinking, though superficially, that even the style of Euphues in its most striking characteristic arose from that connection. Hence a dependence of Shakespeare on Bruno is highly improbable in this instance also. . . . On every page of Euphues there is evidence for the use of the idea of the coincidence of contrasts," and thoughts exactly like those in the Shakespearean passages cited by König are found there. Beyersdorff concludes, rightly in my opinion, that "none of the proffered arguments, neither philosophic nor non-philosophic, require us in any way to assume a dependence of Shakespeare upon Bruno. We must regard the Bruno hypothesis as devoid of any positive confirmation."

König's article, unfortunately, instead of Beyersdorff's book, came to the attention of TYLER (ed. 1890, pp. 101-109), who discussed at length Bruno's

"doctrine of the *Anima Mundi*, the Soul of the World" and its supposed reproduction (p. 101) in 107. As for "the doctrine of the cycles" expounded in 59, 60, and 123, he added (pp. 108 f.), "some points of correspondence in the writings of Bruno and [Tommaso] Campanella might possibly be detected," though it may instead have been derived from ECCLESIASTES or even WILLIAM BALDWIN's *Treatise of Moral Philosophy*, 1547. All the ideas Tyler attributed to Bruno were assigned by Lee to OVID. But STOPES (*Sh.'s Warwickshire Contemporaries*, 1897, p. 9) observed in the sonnets "evident traces" (which she failed to specify) of Bruno. The philosopher's most important works were written and published in England during the years 1583-1585. Thomas Vautrollier in 1584 "fled to Scotland in order to avoid imprisonment for printing" some of them (see MCKERROW, *Dictionary of Printers*, 1910, p. 273).¹ He died in 1587, and about a year later Richard Field, a Stratford man, married the widow and took over Vautrollier's business. Stopes, accordingly, imagines that Sh., a friend of Field, came upon Bruno's works in the Vautrollier-Field bookshop, where "the sayings of Bruno would acquire a tragic interest on his death for a philosophic faith [he was burned alive at Rome, February 17, 1600], and not only in the secret cupboard, but from the conversation of the workmen, we can conceive Shakespeare imbibing some of these." In another place (ed. 1904, p. xxiii) STOPES reasserted, "We know that Giordano Bruno was the philosopher whom Shakespeare followed in the Sonnets." She referred again to Sh.'s reading Bruno in the Vautrollier shop, and designated (p. 187) 59 as beginning "a new sequence . . . referring to some late discussion . . . of Giordano Bruno's philosophy." But her speculations are fanciful, and it was perhaps with them in mind that J. M. MITCHELL and ROBERT ADAMSON (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed., 1910, IV, 686) remark, "It is quite incredible that he [Bruno] met Shakespeare in the printing shop of Thomas Vautrollier."

Meanwhile, BRANDES (*William Sh.*, 1898, II, 10-19) had endorsed Beyersdorff's views, whereas FILON (*Revue des deux mondes*, 1901, 5th series, II, 814), a disciple of Tyler, had written, "It is impossible not to recognize in him [Sh.] a pupil of Giordano Bruno and Campanella." But in 1907 O. ELTON (*Modern Studies*, pp. 26 f.) disposed of the matter thus: "Many scholars have insisted on finding Bruno's thoughts in *Hamlet* or the *Sonnets*, but all such attempts have brought misfortune. The philosophical ideas which recur in Shakespeare . . . are usually incompatible with those of Bruno. Beyersdorff proved this in detail in 1889; and everything confirms his sceptical treatment and refutes the rakers-up of dubious parallels. . . . Shakespeare shows no sign of abjuring the old astronomy which Bruno had risen to subvert. His imagery is firmly tied to the orbs and spheres, even as his sun 'rises on the earth'. . . . Other fancied echoes of Bruno fail to stand analysis. . . . The 'shadow' and 'substance' in Shakespeare's *Sonnets* have been compared with Bruno's *Umbrae Idearum*, but the usage is not the same. Add to this that no contrast or criticism of the current religions is to be safely traced in Shakespeare, while it was Bruno's task to deride many of the doctrines common to the old faith and the new." No real

¹ O. ELTON (*Modern Studies*, 1907, p. 17) denies the Vautrollier connection: "Who produced them is unknown."

proof of the Italian philosopher's influence (which FRANCES A. YATES [*Study of Love's Labour's Lost*, 1936, p. 184] is inclined to accept) has yet been given for the sonnets.

Sh.'s small Latin and less Greek have discouraged searchers for direct sources in the classics. To be sure, VON DANCKELMAN (*Sh. in seinen Sonetten*, 1897, p. 21) affirmed "a wholly remarkable connection between the thought of Shakespeare and the thought of the ancient Roman and Greek poets, . . . a spiritual harmony"; but the affirmation turns out vaguely to mean "that the spirit of classical antiquity lived unconsciously in him." The ultimate source of 153 and 154 is a GREEK ANTHOLOGY epigram, yet nobody has, so far as I know, argued that Sh. read it in its original form. Nor does anybody believe that he knew the Greek of PLATO—or of AESCHYLUS, SOPHOCLES, and EURIPIDES, from whom parallels (see the notes to 3.5 f., 87.13 f., 147) have been adduced. The essential details of Platonism could easily be acquired at second-hand. LEE (*Life*, 1915, p. 177) is correct in saying that "echoes of Plato's ethereal message filled the air of Elizabethan poetry."

RICHARD SIMPSON in 1868 (*Introduction*) was the first to discuss the Platonism and Neo-Platonism of the sonnets (see pp. 157 f., below), and his views have been confirmed or criticized by many subsequent writers.¹ CONRAD (*Archiv*, 1879, LXI, 193-199), BRANDES (*William Sh.*, 1898, I, 341-352), and WYNDHAM (ed. 1898) treat of that subject at some length. "The mystical confusion with and in the Friend of all that is beautiful or lovable in the Poet and others," says Wyndham (pp. cxviii-cxxii), "is a development from the Platonic theory of the IDEA OF BEAUTY: the eternal type of which all beautiful things on earth are but shadows. It is derived by poetical hyperbole from the Poet's prior identification of the Friend's beauty with Ideal Beauty." He credits his friend RALEIGH with suggesting "that Spenser and Shakespeare must have been familiar with Hoby's translation of Baldassare Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano*, published in 1561. Indeed Spenser in his *Hymne in Honour of Beautie* does but versify the argument of Hoby's admirable Fourth Book. . . . Shakespeare must have read Spenser's *Hymn* and Hoby's *Courtyer*, in which Plato, Socrates, and Plotinus are all instanced: the phrase—*genio Socratem*—applied to him in the epitaph on his monument attests his fondness for Platonic theories; he was conversant with these theories, and in the Sonnets he addressed a little audience equally conversant with them; it is, therefore, not surprising that he should have borrowed their terminology. In some sonnets [like 37] he does so, but the *Sonnets* are not . . . an exposition of Plato's theory or of its Florentine developments. Shakespeare in certain passages [see the notes to 1, 19, 31, 53, 105, 107] does but lay under contribution the philosophy of his time just as, in other passages, he lays under contribution the art and occupations of his time, and in others . . . the eternal processes of Nature. His *Sonnets* are no more a treatise of philosophy than they are a treatise of law."

DELIUS (*Jahrbuch*, 1865, I, 32) favors English critics who think that Sh. may have been influenced by VIRGIL's second eclogue; expressions and ideas resembling those of LUCRETIUS, HORACE, JUVENAL, CATULLUS, and ERASMUS (see the notes to 1, 3.5 f., 4.3, 5.9 f., 11.1, 18.9-14, 27, 30, 52.4, 55, 64.4, 86.4, 91, 150) have been here and there observed; but in general OVID is the only

¹ See, for example, LEE and ALDEN, pp. 408 f., 413, below.

Latin writer featured by commentators, like REGIS (*Sh.-Almanach*, 1836) and VON MAUNTZ (*Sh.'s Gedichte*, 1894). LEE (*Quarterly*, 1909, CCX) also discussed the matter in detail, and found (p. 471) "some fifteen sonnets" (15, 18, 19, 44, 45, 55, 59, 60, 63-65, 81, 115, 123, 126) reflecting "Ovid's metaphysical or physical interpretation of the universe." He believed (p. 458)—see also SCOTT (*Sonnets élisabéthains*, 1929, pp. 234-236)—that Sh. used (and indeed knew partly by heart) ARTHUR GOLDING's translation of the *Metamorphoses*, 1567. Later on, RICK (*Jahrbuch*, 1919, LV, 44 f., 50 f.) enumerated direct or indirect borrowings from Ovid's poem in 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 13-15, 19, 55, 59, 60, 63, 64, 123, 126, and others. Ovid "had become common literary property of the Renaissance both in matter and in form," so that it scarcely matters whether Sh. borrowed his ideas and words at first-hand or not.

Finally, WOLFF (*E. S.*, 1932, LXVI, 468 f.) regards the *Μοῦσα παιδική* of antiquity not as a source but as a possible spiritual root of the sonnets. The Italians knew ALBIUS TIBULLUS's three elegies (IV, VIII, IX) in his first book to Delia. In them he offers homage to the beloved Marathus, a handsome boy. Coluccio Salutati owned a Tibullus manuscript (the Codex Ambrosianus); Muretus published the poems in Venice in 1558, J. Scaliger in Paris in 1577. Clearly Tibullus was known in the Renaissance, and his Delia was taken over by Italian, French, and English sonneteers. Classical boy-love made some impression on Italian humanists. Italian sonneteers before and after Sh. praised a beautiful youth as the Petrarchan idea. When, for example, the poet Copetta in his love for Francesco Bigazzini meets both a male and a female rival, his words reflect the three elegies of Tibullus. This matter finally found its way into Sh.'s sonnets. Furthermore, the Roman poets DOMITIUS MARSUS and PROPERTIUS introduced a dark beloved in direct contrast to the blond ideal of their times, and this motif, too, continued down the centuries into Sh.'s day.

As a dramatist Sh. splendidly rifled the living as well as the dead for plots. It would have been normal if many of his sonnets had been adapted or even directly translated—like those of Wyatt, Surrey, or Lodge—from Italian and French poets. Yet a practically world-wide search has discovered no such adaptations or translations. Analogs have been amassed by LEE, WOLFF, and others but few direct sources, if any at all. The essential originality of these lyrics is astonishing to most hardened students of Elizabethan sonnet cycles. In it the autobiographical school of critics may see a further indication that, as a sonneteer, Sh. did look in his heart and write.

APPENDIX VI

THE QUESTION OF AUTOBIOGRAPHY: GENERAL INTERPRETATIONS

What Elizabethan or Jacobean readers thought about the "story" of the sonnets is entirely unknown. Apart from Sh.'s "private friends," other readers from 1599 to 1609 could, like some of the Victorians, have been scandalized by 138 and 144, in which the poet confesses, or seems to confess, grave moral lapses with the dark woman, the worser spirit, and expresses, or seems to express, doubts of the constancy and virtue of his better angel, a man right fair. What BENSON thought in 1640 is likewise unknown, though many theorizers have said (see pp. 23-25, above) that, to conceal a recognizably scandalous narrative, he changed pronouns and added titles with the deliberate intention of making Sh.'s lyrics applicable to a woman.

Eighteenth-century editors, like LINTOTT and GILDON, were apparently not at all interested in the sonnet story. Indeed, the "autobiography" of the sonnets, Mr. W. H., the friend, the dark mistress, the rival poet attracted little attention before the first quarter of the nineteenth century. STEEVENS (ed. 1780), to be sure, was disgusted with the diction and tone of the sonnets addressed to a man. He and MALONE half-heartedly tried to suggest persons who might possibly fit the roles of friend and rival, but it remained for later brains to be agitated and obsessed by problems of autobiography and interpretation. In this respect GEORGE CHALMERS distinguished himself in 1797 (see pp. 248 f., below).

Great impetus to such interpreters was given by A. W. VON SCHLEGEL, who wrote in 1796 (*Sämmtliche Werke*, ed. Eduard Böcking, 1846, VII, 38 n.) that Sh.'s sonnets had been neglected by the editors, that only Steevens and Malone thought it worth while to mention them, the former very unfavorably. But, he contended, they are valuable because they seem to be inspired by a real love and friendship, and because, otherwise, we should know little or nothing about the poet's life. A similar passing remark in *A Course of Lectures* (trans. Black and Morrison, 1846, p. 352) delivered at Vienna in 1808 had loud repercussions in England. "It betrays more than ordinary deficiency of critical acumen in Shakspeare's commentators," the lecturer said, "that none of them, so far as we know, have ever thought of availing themselves of his sonnets for tracing the circumstances of his life. These sonnets paint most unequivocally the actual situation and sentiments of the poet; they make us acquainted with the passions of the man; they even contain remarkable confessions of his youthful errors." Though he gave no further details, the deficiency has since been remedied a thousandfold. His equally famous brother, FRIEDRICH VON SCHLEGEL, on the strength of the *Geschichte der alten und neuen Litteratur*, a series of lectures spoken in 1812 and published at Vienna in 1815, is also frequently cited in this connection by English (not German) writers on the sonnets. But their citations and references—see, for example, RICHARDSON

(*G. M.*, 1835, n. s., IV, 251)—depend upon J. G. LOCKHART's English version, which puts into the German writer's mouth these extremely unliteral and expanded remarks¹ (Philadelphia ed., 1818, II, 144 f.): "It is in these minor pieces of Shakspeare that we are first introduced to a personal knowledge of the great poet and his feelings. When he wrote sonnets, it seems as if he had considered himself as more a poet than when he wrote plays. . . . It is strange but delightful to scrutinize, in his short effusions, the character of Shakspeare. . . . For the right understanding of his dramatic works, these lyrics are of the greatest importance." A. W. von Schlegel and Wordsworth deserve the chief credit, or discredit, for the hundreds of later attempts to pluck the heart out of Sh.'s mystery through the sonnets.

So far as England and America are concerned, WORDSWORTH's was the stronger influence. With no reference to the German critic, in the "Essay" affixed to the first volume of his *Poems*, 1815, he praised (p. 352) "a small Volume of miscellaneous Poems [apparently that of 1640 in some modern reprint] in which Shakespeare expresses his own feelings in his own Person." Twelve years later in "Scorn not the Sonnet," he wrote the famous, if now hackneyed lines, "with this key, Shakspeare unlocked his heart," which have become a sort of war cry. A romantic poet who had unlocked and unpacked his own heart in poems of enormous length, who could scarcely publish the simplest "ballad" without a note explanatory of its when's and why's, Wordsworth naturally supposed that his poetical habits were identical with those of Sh.

One of the earliest Englishmen to express approval of the "Friedrich von Schlegel"-Wordsworth dogma was an anonymous writer (probably JOHN WILSON²) in *Blackwood's*, 1818 (III, 586). He wrote of the sonnets as "invaluable, beyond any thing else of Shakspeare's poetry, because they give us little notices, and occasional glimpses of his own kindred feelings, and of some of the most interesting events and situations of his life." But dissent quickly manifested itself, as in BOSWELL (ed. 1821, p. 220): "I am satisfied that these compositions had neither the poet himself nor any individual in view; but were merely the effusions of his fancy, written upon various topicks for the amusement of a private circle." Other dissenters were Y. J. (*New Monthly Magazine*, 1823, VII, 473, 474 n.) and SKOTTOWE (*Life of Sh.*, 1824, I, 123). According to the former, Sh. "writ his sonnets, most likely, to an ideal mistress." To Skottowe "most of the endeavours to trace the mind of Shakspeare in his Sonnets have been dreams and conjectures wilder and more absurd than the fancies of Warburton." But that the sonnets told a real story he had no doubt (pp. 68 f., 123): Sh.'s mistress slights him, and turns her affections toward "a youth of singular beauty, the dear and intimate companion of Shakspeare himself"; "the subject of the greater number of the Sonnets was, undoubtedly, a male friend of the poet, and Shakspeare's praise of the personal beauty and accomplishments of the favoured youth are [*sic*] far too ardent to be pleasing."

In terms reminiscent of A. W. von Schlegel's the sonnets were discussed by TIECK (*Penelope Taschenbuch*, 1826, pp. 314-339). To him it was incom-

¹ For what he really said see p. 381, below.

² According to A. L. STROUT, *Jahrbuch*, 1936, LXXII, 123.

prekensible (p. 315) that the English commentators "did not find them remarkable as the confessions of a man about whom we know so little, and who, for that very reason, had excited and whetted the curiosity of so many for two centuries." Meanwhile, DRAKE had evolved his Southampton theory in 1817, and B. H. BRIGHT had in 1818-1819 communicated to various friends his "discovery" of Pembroke as the friend. Before Tieck wrote, literary detectives in England were triumphantly tracking down the poet and his two (or more) loves. One of the most sentimental, ANNA JAMESON (*Memoirs of the Loves of the Poets*, 1829 [1833, I, 208]), had no doubts whatever that the sonnets depicted Sh.'s life realistically, and she was apparently the first to suggest that "some of them are addressed to . . . Southampton; and others, . . . in Southampton's name, to . . . Elizabeth Vernon," a suggestion later to be carried to lengths undreamed of by her.

The poet CAMPBELL held other views. In the *New Monthly Magazine*, 1829 (XXVI, 577-583), he ridiculed Schlegel's pronouncements, calling the sonnets (pp. 580 f.) "insignificant as an index to his [Sh.'s] biography," and denying that "they unequivocally paint his passions, and the true character of his sentiments." The first series, 1-126, he goes on, "are not the work of Shakespeare writing in his own unaffected character, how sincere soever the friendship itself may have been, but the fantastical language of a friend in poetical masquerade, exaggerating friendship into love, and painting his sentiments in hyperbolical colours." To these ideas CAMPBELL tenaciously clung. Editing Sh.'s *Dramatic Works* in 1838 (1842 ed., p. xxvii), he returned to the attack: "Beyond some general expressions of his natural feelings, Shakspeare's sonnets give us no access to his personal history. Schlegel says, that they paint his passions unequivocally—but they do no such thing; for they paint his friendship hyperbolically, and mixed with jealousies that belong not to manly friendship. Nor though some twenty of his sonnets are addressed to a female, with whom he feigns himself in love, is it certain that his erotic language, even in these, was not tinged with phantasy? . . . His menacing her with exposure, begets a doubt of his having been deeply attached to the object whom he could thus threaten. I have a suspicion, moreover, that if the love affair had been real, he would have said less about it."

COLLIER (*History of English Dramatic Poetry*, 1831, I, 330 f.) thought it "extremely probable that some of those sonnets were composed for other people, who could not write them for themselves, and who wished to make a favourable impression; but others, undoubtedly, have a personal allusion" to the author. Thus 69 shows that he was "in love with a female who was not very chary of her reputation," and we are forced to believe that, "although a married man, with a wife and family," Sh. "was not immaculate." But a few years later (ed. 1843, p. 475), admitting that he had once believed Sh. to have written some of the lyrics "not in his own person, but for individuals who asked his assistance," COLLIER said, "We entirely abandon that supposition, notwithstanding we are aware that such was not an uncommon practice in Shakespeare's age." Meantime DYCE (ed. 1832, pp. xi f.) had written: "From some of Shakespeare's *Sonnets*, it has been supposed that, after he became a husband, he was by no means remarkable for purity of morals; but . . . no inference respecting his conduct should be drawn from compositions, most of which appear

to have been written under an assumed character." While he was (p. lxxvi) "willing to grant that one or two *Sonnets* have an individual application to the poet," he felt sure that "the greater number of them was composed in an assumed character, on different subjects, and at different times, for the amusement, and probably at the suggestion, of the author's intimate associates." The words of Collier and Dyce encouraged many later commentators to interpret the sonnets as dramatic, not personal, lyrics.

A bit earlier, HARTLEY COLERIDGE (*Blackwood's*, 1828, XXIV, 574) had said: "It is unknown to whom these sonnets were addressed, whether he were a real or an imaginary person. As little information can be derived from them, as to the author's worldly circumstances, habits of life, recreations, studies, politics, or religion." A. W. von Schlegel's Shakespearean criticism was a sore point with Hartley's renowned father, who had openly been accused of plagiarizing it. For that reason alone S. T. C. might well have been disinclined to look upon the sonnets as biographical documents. He did (*Table Talk*, May 14, 1833, ed. H. N. Coleridge, 1835, II, 180 f.) refuse to countenance the Pembroke theory that was publicly announced in 1832: "I do not think that Shakespeare, merely because he was an actor, would have thought it necessary to veil his emotions towards Pembroke under a disguise, though he might probably have done so, if the real object had perchance been a Laura or a Leonora. It seems to me that the sonnets could only have come from a man deeply in love, and in love with a woman; and there is one sonnet¹ which, from its incongruity, I take to be a purposed blind. These extraordinary sonnets form, in fact, a poem of so many stanzas of fourteen lines each; and, like the passion which inspired them, the sonnets are always the same, with a variety of expression,—continuous, if you regard the lover's soul,—distinct, if you listen to him, as he heaves them sigh after sigh."

Before the *Table Talk* was published, RICHARDSON (*G. M.*, 1835, n. s., IV, 250-256, 361-369), discussing the "Confessional Sonnets," quoted and heartily agreed with "both" the Schlegels. He also duplicated (p. 369) the suggestion of Mrs. Jameson: some of the sonnets "are possibly written in the character of Lord Southampton to the 'faire Mrs. Vernon' . . . , and some in the character of that lady to her lover; some are written in the poet's own character." Simultaneously, the author of "The Confessions of William Sh." (*New Monthly Magazine*, 1835, XLIII, 1-9, 306-312, XLIV, 319-336, XLV, 47-69) fervently endorsed A. W. von Schlegel's thesis, which (XLIII, 7) he had not heard of until his own fruitful researches had begun. In the sonnets, he declared, Sh. gives detailed "personal confessions," and he wrote with almost present-day enthusiastic gush about the triangle love-plot. One objection to any strict personal interpretation of the sonnets is that Sh.'s character and morals come off badly—to the distress of many hero-worshippers. So M. R. in the *London and Westminster Review*, 1836 (XXVI, 18), was shocked by the foregoing alleged, but imaginary, "Confessions": "These charges against the dead and great," he retorted indignantly, "have not a particle—a single sand of evidence to rest on." And he was right. M. R., likewise, could not endorse Schlegel's views as a whole. No doubt the sonnets "are partly autobiographical," "though they do not paint they indicate." "They are not to be relied on for the inci-

¹ [Coleridge's editor thinks it 20.]

dents of the life," yet they may "afford useful hints and traces of . . . [Sh.'s] character." He decided that Dyce's theory was much more probable than the German critic's: the sonnets express "the feelings of imaginary characters in imaginary situations."

In 1838 HEINE (*Sämmtliche Werke*, 1876, III, 177) asserted that the sonnets are "authentic records of the circumstances of Shakspeare's life," reflecting deep "human *misère*," and KÜHNE (*Weibliche und männliche Charaktere*, 1838, II, 22) echoed: "To come nearer to Shakspeare's personality and his habits as a man, cognizance of his lyrical effusions is indispensable." C. A. BROWN, in *Sh.'s Autobiographical Poems*, 1838 (see pp. 76 f., above), also proceeded on the assumption that the lyrics made their author's life an open book. Brown would have been shocked and grieved to read CORNEY's animadversion (*Sonnets of William Sh.*, 1862, p. 15): "The man who defames another, without a jot of evidence, defames himself."

The bewilderment of ULRICI (*Sh.'s Dramatic Art* [1839], 1846) in reading the sonnets and their critics is reflected in a series of more or less contradictory pronouncements. Thus at one time (pp. 104, 108) he is confident of their autobiographical details, in which he finds "many traces of the painful struggle which it cost him [Sh.] . . . to maintain this moral empire over himself," though the poet's love for his friend "was perfectly pure." At another (p. 115), he sees not "the slightest foundation" for Collier's soon to be discarded theory that the sonnets were written for other people, not for Sh. himself. Instead "every unbiassed reader . . . will agree" that they mirror their author's life. After this confidence it is somewhat surprizing to read (p. 129) that Sh. "is pre-eminently a *dramatic* poet. . . . In his . . . Sonnets . . . he reveals not merely his own individual personality, he depicts not only the emotions of his own soul, his own experience and views, but still more the character of the personages (whether real or feigned) whom he is addressing, and it is only in the interwoven description of his *own* connexion with them that his individual feelings are allowed to transpire."

CARLYLE naturally included Sh. in his disquisitions on *Heroes and Hero-Worship*, 1840 (ed. A. MacMechan, 1901, p. 124), and he had no hesitancy in terming the sonnets authentic personal utterances: "I call Shakspeare greater than Dante, in that he fought truly, and did conquer. Doubt it not, he had his own sorrows: those *Sonnets* of his will even testify expressly in what deep waters he had waded, and swum struggling for his life;—as what man like him ever failed to have to do?" The balance was quickly restored by KNIGHT (ed. 1841, p. 95): "The Sonnets . . . are personal in their form; but it is not therefore to be assumed that they are *all* personal in their relation to the author." For example, 1-17 are not necessarily to be taken seriously. They may "have been written in the artificial tone of the Italian poetry." In the sequence "there is nothing . . . which might not have been written essentially as a work of fiction,—received as a work of fiction." Sh. had nothing to do with the publication. If he had arranged for it, "a few words of introduction" would have distinguished truth from fiction, the real from the artificial. ROBERT CHAMBERS (*Cyclopaedia*, 1844, I, 105 f.) disposed of the matter by saying that "some . . . may be written in a feigned character, and merely dramatic in expression." Others are true and sincere.

Lecturing to American audiences in 1845,¹ EMERSON (*Representative Men, Complete Works*, 1903, IV, 209) indulged in a rhetorical question: "Who ever read the volume of the Sonnets without finding that the poet had there revealed, under masks that are no masks to the intelligent, the lore of friendship and of love; the confusion of sentiments in the most susceptible, and, at the same time, the most intellectual of men?" Though the questioner had obviously not kept abreast of the "scholarship" of his day, he was seconded across the ocean by R. A. WILLMOTT (*Journal of Summer Time*, 1849 [1928 reprint, p. 19]): the "sonnets are a chapter of autobiography, although remaining in cypher till criticism finds the key." G. W. P. (*American [Whig] Review*, 1848, VIII, 47), however, was certain that "Shakspeare composed his Sonnets chiefly as exercises, artistically creating imaginary conditions within himself, and producing them in required forms." They were not "personally intended."

DELIUS (*Mythus von William Sh.*, 1851, pp. 30 f.; quoted in *Jahrbuch*, 1865, I, 55 f.) forcibly contradicted the personal theory, which makes the sonnets a romantic novel. Aiming his attack very largely at C. A. Brown, he insists that Sh. "and his contemporaries saw no contributions to his biography in the lyric poems, no coherent confessions of his own misfortunes in love and friendship; rather they saw scattered pages, poetic representations of the state of the soul. The same ability (which we marvel at in his plays) to put himself into all emotions and situations as if he himself had endured them is also found in the sonnets; in this respect, although in form they are lyrics, they may be called essentially dramatic. They describe for us love, jealousy, friendship, remorse, all the emotions of the human heart in their most immediate reality, but not necessarily William Shakspeare's love, jealousy, friendship, remorse, not the emotions in William Shakspeare's own heart." In 1878 DELIUS (*Abhandlungen zu Sh.*, pp. x-xiv) reiterated his views, his chief target now being Minto. The younger HAZLITT (ed. 1852, p. 454) meanwhile had admitted the possibility "that the events alluded to . . . may have been altogether imaginary. Shakspeare was never the inventor of a tale. . . . We may think it not unlikely that the fanciful hint of a friend may have originated the sonnets, which, as applied to any conceivable state of facts, appear so inexplicable."

The belief that the sonnets are dramatic, not personal, was forcibly restated in America by WHITE (*Sh.'s Scholar*, 1854, p. 473); "Nearly all of them were evidently written for some other person or persons, according to the fashion of that day for lovers and others to seek assistance from those gifted by the Muse." From such "good paymasters" (p. 476) Sh. got "part of the money" that enabled him to become a shareholder in the London theater. Possibly (p. 474) "a few . . . may have been addressed to his wife," but the references to old age in 62 and 63 demonstrate that Sh. was not writing "in his own person," just as in 71 and 72 "the self-degradation is sufficient to prove that Shakespeare spoke not for himself." 80, 83, 86, and 121 "were evidently written to be presented to some lady," but (p. 476) Sh. could not possibly have seriously addressed "to any woman such gross *double entendres*" as appear in 151, though he might well have written them for another man to send. The assertions in this emotional "argument" are not an unfair specimen of Sh.

¹ See p. 371 n., below.

scholarship at its so-called best. Of their validity WHITE had no doubts. A decade later (ed. 1865, p. 147) he insisted that "in only . . . 111, 135, and 136, is he [Sh.] unmistakably speaking in his own person. . . . As to the motives of the rest we have only that kind of internal evidence which addresses itself to the judgment of the individual reader. They may, or they may not, have been the direct and deliberate expressions of his own feeling; and some of them, as . . . [1-22] are of such a nature that it is difficult to conjecture why they should have been written by any man." Dyce, then, was right (p. 149) in saying that the sonnets were composed "in an assumed character on different subjects, and at different times." If they had been autobiographical (p. 150), "would Shakespeare, or the man for whom he wrote, have shown about among his friends these evidences of so profound an emotion, these witnesses of an internal struggle that went near to shatter his whole being?"

The words of BELL (ed. 1855, pp. 148, 152) are restrained and wise: "If the Sonnets were so strongly imbued with the auto-biographical element as their interpreters have assumed, the probability is that they would have spoken a more definite language." "It is impossible to read them without constructing out of them a theory of some kind. . . . [But] it can neither be proved, nor denied, that the Sonnets reflect something of the life of Shakspeare. All poetry is auto-biographical. But the particle of actual life out of which verse is wrought may be, and almost always is, wholly incommensurate to the emotion depicted, and remote from the forms into which it is ultimately shaped." Yet a few months later MASSON (*Essays*, 1856, p. 12) attempted to summarize opinion thus: "Criticism seems now pretty conclusively to have determined . . . that the *Sonnets* of Shakespeare are, and can possibly be, nothing else than a poetical record of his own feelings and experience. . . . [They] *are* auto-biographic—distinctly, intensely, painfully autobiographic." To LAFOND (*Poèmes . . . de Sh.*, 1856, p. xiv) they are "like pages taken from a diary." Such pronouncements make one wish that "I believe," "personally I think," and similar qualifications were more commonly used.

HUDSON (ed. 1856, p. 118), as always, was satisfied to paraphrase other editors' speculations: "The greater part of the Sonnets . . . were intended mainly as flights or exercises of fancy, thrown into the form of a personal address, and written, it may be, in some cases at the instance or in compliment of the Poet's personal friends, and perhaps mingling an element of personal interest or allusion, merely as a matter of art; whatsoever there is personal in them being thus kept subordinate and incidental to poetical beauty and effect." None too clear, if more original, is the remark of STAUNTON (ed. 1860, p. 759) that, although the sonnets "are, apparently, grounded on actual incidents in his [Sh.'s] career, they are, for the most part, if not wholly, poetical fictions . . . written on different occasions, and with no more adaptation of fact to fancy than is usually found in imaginary compositions." "The sonnets," MÉZIÈRES (*Sh. ses œuvres*, 1860, p. 57) comments, "give us an insight into the history of the intimate feelings of Shakspeare. They still leave a great many obscurities in this mysterious career, but they lift a corner of the veil and reveal to us a loving soul, capable of vividly feeling joy and sorrow, but more susceptible, like all choice natures, to sad emotions, and more disposed to melancholy than to gayety. The thought carries the imprint of sincerity, although to discern

it one must remove the artificial ornaments which cover it." The opposite belief is emphasized by CORNEY (*Sonnets of William Sh.*, 1862, pp. 6, 11): "They are, with very slight exceptions, mere *poetical exercises*." His emphasis was largely the result of a conviction that "the writers who treat the sonnets as biographic materials either contradict . . . [the dedication], or require our assent to improbabilities, or cast aspersions on the moral character of our admired poet." J. F. CLARKE (*Memorial and Biographical Sketches*, 1878, p. 315) quickly reassured America (1864) by saying: "When we read these sonnets, we seem to stand by the door of the confessional, and listen to the most secret secrets of the hearts of Shakspeare. These mysteries are veiled in a language so wonderfully delicate, that it at once tells all, and tells nothing. . . . No writer ever gave us himself so purely and personally as Shakspeare does in his sonnets."

"The prevailing opinion among the most recent commentators," KENNY (*Life and Genius*, pp. 53 f.) maintained in 1864, "seems to be that . . . [the sonnets] were, for the most part, produced by the poet in a purely fanciful and fictitious character." There is room to doubt that such an opinion actually prevailed, but Kenny (pp. 79 f.) strongly disagreed with it, and felt sure that he could get authentic details of Sh.'s life from the quatorzains. CARL HEBLER's notion (*Aufsätze über Sh.* [1864], 1874, p. 17), however, was that a novelist will have better luck in interpreting the sonnets than a biographer. That "a man of Shakespeare's practical wisdom . . . would have had the incredible folly to record the story of his indiscretions" seemed to HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS (ed. 1865, p. 369) inconceivable. The mere thought he vigorously combated in the successive editions of his *Outlines* (as the 1882 edition, p. 110): "If the personal theory be accepted, we must concede the possibility of our national dramatist gratuitously confessing his own sins and revealing those of others, proclaiming his disgrace and avowing his repentance, in poetical circulars distributed by the delinquent himself amongst his own intimate friends." The possibility failed to distress E. W. SIEVERS (*William Sh.*, 1866, p. 87); rather it pleased him to regard the sonnets "as genuine outpourings of the heart," baring Sh.'s "innermost being."

The most elaborate and bulky study of the sonnets up to its date was published by MASSEY in 1866 (revised edition, 1888). He complains (p. 7) that Wordsworth "had read the sonnets for their poetry," not their message, and had thus got only "a little nearer to the spirit" of Sh. The real spirit is (Mrs. Jameson, Richardson, Collier, and White had long before suggested it) that they are (ed. 1888, p. 16) "*both Dramatic and Personal*." The suggestion that pure autobiography appears in the sonnets was abhorrent to Massey as an insult to Sh.'s memory, and so he assigns them (see pp. 88-90, above) to their supposed writers, or speakers, Southampton, Elizabeth Vernon, Pembroke, and others. FORSYTH (*Shakspeare*, 1867, pp. 22 f., 25-31) thought the sonnets dramatic—otherwise their author would be "a sycophant, a flatterer, a breaker of marriage vows, a whining and inconstant person"—but he attacked Massey's views with telling effect. Many others, like an anonymous writer in the *Spectator*, 1873 (XLVI, 340 f.), considered Massey a scarcely more satisfactory guide than Barnstorff (see p. 157, below). But his theory was enthusiastically taken over by GELBCKE (*Sh.'s Sonette*, 1867) and by KRAUSS. In the words

of the latter (*Nord und Süd*, 1879, VIII, 229; see also his *Sh.'s Southampton-Sonette*, 1872, pp. 5 f.), it "leaves no spots on the poet's character; . . . it reaffirms his virility and renders unto woman what is woman's; it affords Shakespeare scope for the free creativeness of his imagination, as well as for his particular ability in dramatic representation, and also makes room for humor and satire." The dramatic theory has more recently been upheld by C. W. FRANKLYN, E. G. CRAIG, GROTH, and others. The first insists (*Westminster Review*, 1889, CXXXII, 355): "It was no uncommon thing for authors to write what others were to use as their own. A gentleman ordered an ode . . . on as business-like a principle as we order a new hat, or commission a new picture." One would be grateful for proof of this oft-repeated statement:¹ minor poets like Turberville and Gascoigne, to be sure, confess having written love poems for others, but what greater poet seriously does so?² "That Shakespeare wrote them for money seems to me obvious," says Craig (*Books*, 1925, p. 154), who is not entirely serious; he had many clients, and the sonnets were written to their order. Groth (*Beiblatt*, 1930, XLI, 137) concedes that some of the poems are personal, but "this fact does not exclude the assumption that . . . [Sh.] wrote other poems to order in his younger days, for colleagues in the theater or for cavaliers, who, following the fashion, wished to pay homage to their patrons or ladies in 'sugred sonnets.' "

BODENSTEDT (*Sh.'s Sonette*, 1866, p. 234) in general bowed to the authority of Delius. His compatriot NEIDHARDT (*Sh.'s kleinere Dichtungen*, 1870, pp. v f.) denied that the sonnets are fiction: "the personality of the poet speaks to us here." Although HENRY BROWN (*Sonnets of Sh.*, 1870, pp. 7, 35 f.) believed that they "are pre-eminently parodies," making a satire "upon mistress-sonnetting" and upon contemporary sonneteers, especially Drayton and Davies, he nevertheless declared that all "are autobiographical, containing much that is valuable." KREYSSIG (*Sh.-Fragen*, 1871, pp. 70, 73) described them as "a poetic molding of things personally seen and felt"; some may be poetic exercises, but, as a whole, they form Sh.'s "poetic diary." An unknown writer (*Magazin für die Literatur des Auslandes*, 1871, LXXX, 520) preferred not to see in them genuine emotions; but as for their being literary exercises, he could not believe Sh. guilty of such bad taste as to write variations on the theme of love for a man merely to gain practise in versifying. VON FRIESEN's verdict (*Sh.-Studien*, 1874, I, 338-344) was that they are the poetic residue of personal experiences, either real or imagined; in short, that they are the events of actuality transmuted by imagination. No identities can therefore be revealed; no specific events can be discovered. KARL FULDA (*William Sh.*, 1875, p. 51) described Sh.'s lyrics as "coherent confessions" revealing "the depths and the heights, the most secret recesses of his poetic genius." He was attacking Delius. GILDEMEISTER (*Sh.'s Sonette*, 2d ed., 1876, pp. xxi-xxv), however, follows the latter; the sonnets, he writes, cannot in any way be autobiographical. They are the compositions of the world's greatest dramatist,

¹ See p. 222, below.

² Compare also George Wither, *Abuses Stript and Whipt*, 1622, sig. D7^v: "Dunces can haue Sonnets fram'd, and send them As their inuentions, when some others pend them."

and as such are no more revelations of his life and character than are his plays. Just then, also, ELZE (*William Sh.* [1876], 1888, pp. 435 f.) was voicing his opposition to any personal interpretation. To him the sonnets may well "have been mere poetical conceits with which Shakespeare amused himself and his friends." Perhaps he wrote some "at the request of friends" who "could not put their love-sighs into rhyme." At any rate, "no importance can be attached to any attempt made to form an idea of Shakespeare's disposition from the Sonnets, and least of all can they serve as a foundation, or as evidence for the delineation of the poet's character." The Dutch translator BURGERSDIJK (*Sh.'s Sonnetten*, 1879, p. xiii) agreed, saying that the sonnets, though lyric in form, are really dramatic, and hence that their author's honor remains unblemished.

But to the American poet LANIER (*Sh. and His Forerunners* [1879], 1902, I, 255 f.) the sonnets told a true, shocking story of a faithless friend and a fickle mistress. Somewhat earlier FURNIVALL (ed. 1877, pp. lxiii, lxvi) had expressed his surprize that "many critics really deserving the name of Shakspere students, and not Shakspere fools, have held the Sonnets to be merely dramatic," and had categorically declared, "No one can understand Shakspere who does not hold that his Sonnets are autobiographical, and that they explain the depths of the soul of the Shakspere who wrote the plays." For once SWINBURNE was in agreement with his enemy. In 1880 (*Fortnightly*, XXXIV, 714 f.) he belabored Browning, then president of the New Sh. Society, which he despised, saying: "Browning . . . cites with something of a sneer the well-known expression of Wordsworth . . . and . . . retorts in a tone of assured defiance—'Did Shakespeare? If so, the less Shakespeare he!' No, I must venture to reply; no whit the less like Shakespeare, but undoubtedly the less like Browning." But equilibrium was restored by J. A. NOBLE, 1880 (*Sonnet in England*, 1893, p. 28): "Wordsworth . . . surely erred when he said that in these poems Shakspeare unlocked his heart, for the precious collection is still . . . 'sealed with seven seals.'" To STENGEL (*E. S.*, 1881, IV, 7), the sonnets are "only a series of studies by the great painter of the soul, little pieces of artifice," intended to entertain Sh.'s "private friends." But DOWDEN (ed. 1881, pp. 16 f.) dissented and appealed to authority for support: "With Wordsworth, Sir Henry Taylor, and Mr. Swinburne; with François-Victor Hugo, with Kreyssig, Ulrici, Gervinus, and Hermann Isaac; with Boaden, Armitage Brown, and Hallam; with Furnivall, Spalding, Rossetti, and Palgrave, I believe that Shakspeare's Sonnets express his own feelings in his own person." STEUERWALD (*Lyrisches im Sh.*, 1881, p. 17), too, definitely took "the side of those who give the sonnets an autobiographical character. The impression received from reading the sonnets determined this opinion; one is justified in adhering to such a view, supported by the judgment of important critics, until sufficiently convincing proofs have been brought forward for another belief." Far more impressive is the comment of NIETZSCHE, around 1881 (*Morgenröthe*, Aphorism 76, trans. J. M. Kennedy, in *Complete Works*, ed. Oscar Levy, 1911, IX, 77): "The passions become evil and malignant when regarded with evil and malignant eyes. It is in this way that Christianity has succeeded in transforming Eros and Aphrodite—sublime powers, capable of idealisation—into hellish genii and phantom goblins, by means of the pangs which every sexual impulse was made

to raise in the conscience of the believers. Is it not a dreadful thing to transform necessary and regular sensations into a source of inward misery, and thus arbitrarily to render interior misery necessary and regular *in the case of every man!* Furthermore, this misery remains secret, with the result that it is all the more deeply rooted; for it is not all men who have the courage, which Shakespeare shows in his sonnets, of making public their Christian gloom on this point."¹

At first ROLFE (ed. 1883, p. 11) found it "difficult to believe" that all the sonnets were autobiographical or that 1-126 were addressed to one person; but, as his preface (p. 5) shows, after mulling over Dowden's edition, he veered to the other side. By 1904 (*Life*, pp. 333-339) he was whole-heartedly arguing in support of the personal theory. Confessions are, of course, to be found in the sonnets, MAX KOCH (*E. S.*, 1883, VI, 250) admitted, but only in rare instances can we separate truth and poetry. Hypotheses about their meaning abound, but "ignoramus, ignorabimus." Just as this time MACKAY (*Nineteenth Century*, 1884, XVI, 242) entered the controversy as a cocksure advocate of the dramatic theory. The notion of autobiography was "a misconception of the critic or critics who first promulgated the idea, and a blind following of the blind by those who have since adopted it." HENRY COCHIN (*Revue des deux mondes*, 1885, 3d series, LXXII, 131), however, describes the sonnets as "a very ingenious literary exercise." KÖRTING's opinion (*Grundriss*, 1887, pp. 222 f.) was that no "satisfactory interpretation" had yet been made, and that, although the sonnet personages were real people, no critical biography of Sh. can be based upon the lyrics. GERTRUDE GARRIGUES (*Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, 1887, XXI, 242 f.), however, stigmatized autobiographical interpretation as "a gratuitous insult" to Sh.'s memory. She traced in the sonnets "the soul life of our great poet—the early enthusiastic desire for a contemplative life; the strong impelling force, which lay within himself, and drove him into activity; the vain struggle and suffering; the renunciation and reconciliation." On the contrary to APPLETON MORGAN (*Sh. in Fact*, 1888, p. 34) the sonnets "are not either autobiographical of their author or biographical of anybody else."

The "misconception" deplored by Mackay and Morgan flourished. SACHS (*Jahrbuch*, 1890, XXV, 151) voiced regret that the experiences Sh. writes about are "of so dubious a nature" as to "cast a dark shadow" on his character. The only "rational explanation of the facts," VERITY (ed. 1890, pp. 399 f.) protested, "adopts the personal interpretation of the Sonnets as records of Shakespeare's own feelings." Sh. (p. 401) "is the real speaker in every line." But writers on Sh. usually interpret "the facts" to suit their own preconceptions, ignoring J. A. SYMONDS's warning (*Essays Speculative*, 1890, I, 118) that competent critics should avoid "any temptation to construct a biographical romance out of elements so slender, until irrefutable facts have been presented."² In even more agnostic vein SHINDLER (*G. M.*, 1892, CCLXXII,

¹ According to ALBERT LUDWIG (*Jahrbuch*, 1920, LVI, 30 f.) Nietzsche's "hatred" of Sh. resulted from his reading the sonnets. To him "actor" represented everything that was despicable, and the "hatred was directed only against the actor who in his innermost being could be nothing else."

² Italian writers have been especially devoted to the notion of autobiography

82) reminds us, "The facts of Shakespeare's life are so little known that we can never be quite sure of anything, and in most cases even the more ingenious conjectures can hardly show a decent appearance of probability. The wisest course would seem to be to accept the Sonnets as they stand, and definitely to abandon a problem for the solution of which there are no sufficient data."

VON MAUNTZ (*Jahrbuch*, 1893, XXVIII, 279 f.) betrays the influence of Massey in preferring the hypothesis that Sh. wrote on experiences and thoughts he believed some of his friends to have had. The influence is stronger still in his translation of Sh.'s *Gedichte*, 1894, where a number of the sonnets are said (p. 333) to be dramatic and the speakers are imagined to be Southampton and Elizabeth Vernon. This book had hardly been published when CONRAD (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, 1895, LXXIX, 183 f.) uttered his delight at the general abandonment (presumably in Germany) of all interpretations except the autobiographical, and for the change in sentiment he took considerable personal credit. In his school, though hardly his student, was MASSON, who about 1895 (*Sh. Personally*, 1914, p. 196) spoke of the sonnets as "expressly and thoroughly autobiographical," but with notable self-restraint he refrained from attempting to identify any of their personages. BOAS (*Sh. and His Predecessors*, 1896, p. 115) declared, "It is inconceivable that such intensity of passion as they reveal . . . should spring from no solid basis of fact," and in Germany VON DANCKELMAN (*Sh. in seinen Sonetten*, 1897, p. 15) echoed that the very idea was "monstrous." Exactly how inconceivable and monstrous it really is, the preceding and following pages show.

At the present day LEE is usually regarded as the chief British upholder of the theory of imitation and literary exercises, though it had been urged for decades before he entered the lists. Few people today know that Lee changed his mind about this matter with an amazing suddenness—a suddenness, completely unexplained and unmentioned, like that with which he discarded the Pembroke for the Southampton theory. In the life of Sh. published in the London edition of the *D. N. B.*, 1897 (LI, 363), he wrote of the sonnets: "Attempts have been made to represent them as purely literary exercises, mainly on the ground that a personal interpretation seriously reflects on Shakespeare's moral character (cf. HALLIWELL-PHILLIPS). But only the two concluding sonnets (cliii. and cliv.) can be regarded by the unbiassed reader as the artificial product of a poet's fancy. Whether by accident or design, these recall an apologue illustrating the potency of love which figures in the Greek anthology. . . . In the rest of the 'Sonnets' Shakespeare avows, although in phraseology that is often cryptic, the experiences of his own heart (cf. C. ARMITAGE BROWN, *Shakespeare's Autobiographical Poems*, 1838; RICHARD SIMPSON, *Philosophy of Shakespeare's Sonnets*, 1868). Their uncontrolled ardour suggests that they came from a youthful pen—from a man not more

in the sonnets; as LEVI (*Studi su Sh.*, 1875, p. 2), TIRINELLI (*Nuova antologia*, 1878, 2d series, VIII, 257 f.), CHIARINI (the same, 1890, 3d series, XXVI, 13 f.), OLIVIERI (*Sh.'s Sonetti*, 1890, pp. xxx f.), GARLANDA (*Guglielmo Sh.*, 1900, pp. 287 f.), BORGHESI (*Petrarch and His Influence*, 1906, pp. 110 f.), and PRAZ (*Storia della letteratura inglese*, 1937, p. 81). CROCE (*Ariosto, Sh., and Corneille*, 1920, pp. 192 f.) dissents.

than thirty." Londoners had scarcely read these words before Lee ordered them cut from the plates, and so in the New York edition of 1897 (LI, 363) the passage is entirely different: "Many critics are convinced that . . . Shakespeare avows the experiences of his own heart (cf. C. ARMITAGE BROWN . . . 1838; RICHARD SIMPSON . . . 1868). . . . While Shakespeare's poems bear traces of personal emotion and are coloured by personal experience, they seem to have been to a large extent undertaken as literary exercises. His ever-present dramatic instinct may be held to account for most of the illusion of personal confession which they call up in many minds. Their style suggests that they came from a youthful pen—from a man not more than thirty."

Having traveled, as it were, from the North Pole to the South in the course of a few weeks, LEE's mind hardened on the subject of the literary-exercises theory, which he reiterated, mindless of criticism, to the end of his life. In 1898 (*Cornhill*, n. s., IV, 489; compare *Fortnightly*, LXIX, 223) he announced: "A genuine strain of autobiography can only be dogmatically assigned to the dozen or more sonnets" on the friend (Southampton) as patron—26, 32, 38, 69, 78–86. The claim that the sonnets are "autobiographical documents" (*Life*, 1898, p. 100) "can only be accepted with many qualifications. . . . A strain of personal emotion is occasionally discernible in a detached effort, and is vaguely traceable in a few sequences; but autobiographical confessions were very rarely the stuff of which the Elizabethan sonnet was made." Lee's tactical mistake was to insist here (p. 109) and in subsequent publications that because he had proved sonnets in general, and Elizabethan sonnets in particular, to abound in conventionalities and imitations, he had likewise proved that the autobiographical element in Sh.'s, "although it may not be dismissed altogether, is seen to shrink to slender proportions." He found (p. 111) that "adapted or imitated conceits are scattered over the whole of Shakespeare's collection," and he everywhere insisted that imitation and sincerity can never go hand in hand. Such comments as (p. 151), "the imitative element in his [Sh.'s] sonnets is large enough to refute the assertion that in them as a whole he sought to 'unlock his heart,' " have irritated many later critics,¹ who, in emphasizing that personal revelations and imitation are not necessarily antithetic, sometimes overlook Lee's bows in the direction of the personal theory. Many persons, as Boswell, Dyce, Campbell, Halliwell-Phillipps, Delius, Gilde-meister, Stengel, Mackay, and Morgan had made no concessions whatever to autobiography. Lee made many, thereby greatly weakening his position; for while he described (pp. 152–154) most of the sonnets as "merely literary meditations, conceived by the greatest of dramatists," and could discover in only six (40–42, 133, 134, 144) "a strand of wholly original sentiment," at the same time he regarded the friend, Mr. W. H., and the rival poet as actual persons, in identifying whom he piled up ingenious, if unconvincing, details.

T. R. PRICE (*Studies in Honor of . . . Gildersleeve*, 1902, p. 363) optimistically welcomed the new twentieth century as superior to its predecessor because it began "with a general confession of the futility of that criticism which has too long been exercised upon the sonnets of Shakspeare. The biographical theory may frankly be said to have failed." But he reckoned without the

¹ BUTLER (ed. 1899, pp. 41–57) spoke of the difficulty "in the determining what his opinions really are," and then proceeded to demolish what he did find.

host. Patent antagonism to Lee's method of approach dominated the pronouncements of many writers, as they hastened to brandish the keys that unlock, or partially unlock, the sonneteer's heart. "Instinctively French critics," HENRY (*Sonnets de Sh.*, 1900, pp. xxiv, xxvi-xxix) remarked, "have preferred the simplest theory, the one which best satisfies our hereditary need for precision and clarity, I mean the personal theory. And all, or nearly all, believe that the sonnets are echoes of the poet's heart." Euphuism, Platonism, Petrarchanism all influenced the style, yet the individuality of the poet none the less becomes apparent. As for the faults of which Sh. accuses himself, they do not seem serious to Henry. Only "English prudery and cant" are disturbed at the choice of subject. Yet this very choice argues for the personal hypothesis, since conventionality would not have permitted it. One cannot find a definitive autobiography in the sonnets, but merely hints about the poet's personality. Another foreigner, HESSEN (*Leben Sh.'s*, 1904, p. 203) sarcastically asked whether Sh. alone among great writers lacked such experience as inspired Goethe and Schiller to verse composition and merely "sucked his fingers" for inspiration when he felt like writing sonnets. BEECHING (ed. 1904, p. xxiii) read Lee a lecture: "It by no means follows, because a poet uses a fashionable and artificial form of verse, that the emotion he puts into it is merely fashionable and artificial. It may be or it may not be. We must not forget that, although the sonnet was fashionable at this epoch, the passion of love had perhaps as great a vogue as the sonnet." Again BEECHING (in Bullen, ed. 1907, p. 364) insisted "that the story of the Sonnets represents a real experience; for, indeed, a dramatist of Shakespeare's skill and genius could hardly have written an imaginary drama of passion, in which there were so many broken links." In reply one might hazard the conjecture that some of the lyrics written by Sh., the "broken links," have not survived. MORE (*Shelburne Essays*, 2d series, 1905, p. 2) dismissed Lee's arguments in terms almost identical with Beeching's: "Because a poem is manifestly an imitation or even a barefaced theft, it does not always follow that the incident described is unreal or that the sentiment is insincere." He felt (p. 20) "that with this key the poet did veritably unlock his heart." Then RALEIGH (*Shakespeare*, 1907, pp. 87 f.) none too accurately declared that "by general consent" the sonnets "were private documents; they were not intended by Shakespeare for our perusal, but were addressed to individuals. To say that they do not 'express his own feelings in his own person,' is as much as to say that they are not sincere. And every lover of poetry who has once read the Sonnets knows this to be untrue." But is it true that disbelievers in the personal theory are not lovers of poetry?

BRADLEY (*Oxford Lectures*, 1909, pp. 330-332) heartily approved Beeching's attitude toward the personal theory. While granting "that *some* of these poems may be mere exercises of art," and "that all of them are poems, and not letters, much less *affidavits*," he is nevertheless sure that essentially they tell a true story. "The story is very odd and unattractive. Such capacities as it has are but slightly developed. It is left obscure, and some of the poems are unintelligible. . . . Now all this is perfectly natural if the story is substantially a real story of Shakespeare himself and of certain other persons. . . . It is all unnatural . . . if . . . we regard the sonnets as a free product of mere imagination."

Not much real aid was given to the anti-Lee school by the advocacy of HARRIS (*Man Sh.*, 1909, p. 199), to whom the sonnets, though autobiographical, are less revealing than the plays. "It was natural enough that Wordsworth, a great lyric poet, should catch Shakespeare's accent better in his sonnets than in his dramas; but that is owing to Wordsworth's limitations. And if the majority of later English critics have agreed with Wordsworth, it only shows that Englishmen in general are better judges of lyric than of dramatic work." Harris's detailed account (pp. 203-211) of how in his dramas Sh. displays his life and loves went far to make the entire personal theory appear ridiculous. Yet SMEATON (*Shakespeare*, 1911, p. 468) wrote, as if there were no dispute, "We have seen that they are autobiographic; that in them Shakespeare speaks in his own person, of his own individual feelings." That the sequence is "no conventional exercise is sufficiently obvious" also to FIGGIS (*Shakespeare*, 1911, p. 322) "from the fact that the story it tells is no conventional story. The same argument dismisses the thought that the Sonnets, if not conventional, were at least occupied with a fiction; for the story is not only unconventional, it is decidedly unpleasant. . . . [It is] occupied with an undeniable, if undesirable, relation of actual life."

BRANDL (*Sh.s Sonette*, 1913, pp. xxx f., xlv) had no patience with scholars who assume that the themes of the sonnets are imaginary, because, although many of his details are found in his predecessors and contemporaries, Sh., more than any other sonneteer, has broken away from conventions. Numerous things are still far from clear, but the sonnets do tell an autobiographical story, and (p. xlix) they speak all the more strongly when recognized for what they are—true, occasional poems. According to KELLNER (*E. S.*, 1933, LXVIII, 65-78), Brandl's predilection for finding autobiography is carried over into the very text of Sh. in the 1913 German translation which he edited with LUDWIG FULDA, most noticeably in the so-called, and miscalled, political sonnets 66, 107, 108, 124, 125.

The special attraction of the poems to ROEDDER (*Sh.s Sonette*, 1913, pp. 3-9) lies in the fact that Sh. here speaks about himself. We see him happy in his friendship with a man, and 1-17 would be foolish compositions unless he had had an actual person in mind. In the love sonnets he shows himself hopelessly entangled by a violent passion for a woman who has less beauty than wit and grace. Roedder acknowledges that, as Lee has shown, the sequence makes use of various conventions; but he appears to have no doubt that in general the sonnets, especially 1-126, are personal confessions. Such, too, is the idea of SIEPER (*Sh. und seine Zeit*, 1913, pp. 61-66). Still another German scholar, SARRAZIN, completely rejects the fiction and literary-exercises theory (*Internationale Monatsschrift*, 1914, VIII, 1075 f.). To any careful reader the sonnets reveal (p. 1082) "a passionate artistic soul, yearning for beauty, thirsting for love and friendship. A lonely, poor, profoundly unhappy man, who longs, deep within himself, for wife and children and therefore urges his young friend to found a family. A poet who, permeated by his poetic power and his art, appears noble to himself, yet realizes that he is an outcast, an outlaw. A man who, in the youthful vigor of his creative work, already seems to himself aged and weary of life. An actor who depreciates his profession and feels that his innermost being is changed and ruined by it . . . [111.6 f.]." The deep melancholy (pp. 1083 f.) "is based not only on unhappy

love, but primarily on the poet's sufferings, on his experiences in the plague years of 1592-1593, on his separation from his family, on his profession, and especially on his solitariness." As for the calumny several times referred to, Sarrazin (pp. 1089 f.) thinks it concerned Sh.'s Stratford activities as a poacher—false activities gossiped about by Londoners jealous of his growing fame. It is, one may decide, too bad that such a gift of clairvoyance was expended on scholarly and critical subjects.

To CREIZENACH (*English Drama*, 1916, p. 92) the sonnets "disclose the poet's most intimate feelings"; and to REED (ed. 1923, p. 95) they give "glimpses of Shakespeare the man. . . . Shakespeare may not have 'unlocked his heart' in these poems; but surely at times he left the door ajar." LANDAUER (*Shakespeare*, 1920, II, 358 f.) emphatically declares that Sh. "had some uncanny corporeal misadventure; after long investigation I must believe that it was connected in some way with his continually repeated laments about faults and blemishes in his life, about contempt and shame. These laments certainly cannot everywhere be explained by his profession of actor. In his thirties begin the moving laments that he is old, tired, exhausted, and they become increasingly fiercer and sharper. . . . Those who can may explain these outcries away as literary exercises lacking reality. I believe I am a good judge of the genuineness of emotion, and I cannot do so." The sonnets, he continues (p. 391), are Sh.'s letters—"letters to only one or two definite addressees, letters which are not merely personal documents, but also works of art; yet from here we can penetrate the soul of the man, here is the point at which the works, the plays, are united with the man, with the personality."

"Whatever may be our estimate of the precise value of the Sonnets as autobiography," MURRY wrote in 1921 (*Countries of the Mind*, 1st series, 1922, p. 11), "it is impossible for any one but a briefed advocate to assert that they do not substantially contain the record of the poet's own disaster in love." Such is the opinion also of AGNES M. MACKENZIE (*Women in Sh.'s Plays*, 1924, p. 461). She is "entirely unable to believe them mere inventions." An unoriginal argument follows: "Apart from the sincerity of the verse itself, if Shakespeare had been writing a sonnet-cycle on the relations of imaginary people, he would have made it reasonably coherent and intelligible." Also opposed to Lee is ELISE DECKNER (*Beiblatt*, 1926, XXXVII, 286): "Though the poet may have paid his tribute to the taste of the times in his sonnets, none the less these poems remain, beyond all conventionality, the most important document of his loving and suffering, of his struggling, and of his human greatness." With similar emphasis GILLET (*Shakespeare*, 1931, p. 128) writes: "No one else has ever taken such great pains [as Lee] to persuade us that a great poet wrote in order to say nothing. The sonnets of Shakespeare are probably the most beautiful poem of the Renaissance. Why did Sir Sidney Lee hold that there was absolutely no sense in them? Ah! because the story glimpsed in them is horrible. There is nothing more atrocious in the contemporary novel. I understand that such frankness is painful. But if this drama is conjured away, let us give up all idea of understanding Shakespeare." He draws an analogy (pp. 126 f.): "Suppose that we had one hundred fifty letters by Racine, one hundred fifty love letters, a whole impassioned correspondence, the most ardent letters that exist besides those of Mlle. de Lespi-

nasse and those of the Portuguese nun. Such are Shakespeare's *Sonnets*." RALLI (*History of Shakespearian Criticism*, 1932, II, 129) makes the point that Lee touches the autobiographical element "so lightly and states the opposite case with such skill, that the impression on the reader is unequivocal. We suggest that . . . he has been beguiled by his own phrases. . . . He pondered the subject till his subconscious mind gathered force and supplied the best words for one solution, so that he became self-convinced and slightly overstated what after all belongs to conjecture."

In the frequent denial of autobiography in the sonnets L. P. SMITH (*On Reading Sh.*, 1933, pp. 8 f.) sees traditional British hypocrisy: "The story Shakespeare recounts of his moral—or rather his immoral—predicament between these 'two loves' [of 144] . . . must certainly, in the interests of the British Empire, be smothered up; the business of proving and re-proving, and proving over again . . . that our Shakespeare cannot possibly mean what he so frankly tells us, has become almost a national industry." GREGOR (*Shakespeare*, 1935, p. 535) justifies those who look in the sonnets for a key to unlock the secret of Sh.'s tragic adventures. Conclusions drawn from the plays are uncertain. Therefore these poems are a treasure doubly precious, but likewise doubly dangerous, and the greatest tact is needed to make the necessary deductions. The important thing (p. 547) is that Sh. bared so candidly the details of his twisted love affair, that he was not afraid to confess, no matter how confession affected his reputation. The sonnets, according to C. CLARK (*Sh. and Psychology*, 1936, p. 146) are "obviously" autobiographical. Sh. "made use of known conventions of all kinds, even borrowing ideas and metaphors; but all of it was simply the vehicle for his burning thoughts." H. W. WELLS (*S. A. B.*, 1937, XII, 121) decides that "the fairly consistent story as told in the *Sonnets* points to real life, and its relatively loose and illogical development argues less for fiction than for reality"; while W. L. PHELPS (American Philosophical Society *Proceedings*, 1939, LXXXI, 573 f.) suggests that the publication of Q, in which "there is one sonnet that is wholly obscene and others that allude to various rather scandalous affairs," caused Sh. to leave London and to retire to the seclusion of Stratford, where he abandoned his writing. Autobiography had, it would seem, consequences disastrous for literature if fortunate for later critics; but perhaps Phelps is incorrect. He is, according to J. F. NISBET (*Insanity of Genius*, 1891, pp. 155-157), who attributes Sh.'s return to Stratford and his abandonment of literature at the early age of forty-eight to nervous disorders and paralytic shocks.

One of the cleverest and most amusing contributions to the discussion of autobiography in the sonnets appeared at Sydney in 1920: GREGORY THORNTON's *Sonnets of Sh.'s Ghost*. Its wrapper informed readers (according to the *T. L. S.*, May 26, 1921, p. 342) that "more scientific methods of establishing 'contact' now in vogue have enabled him (Shakespeare) at last to speak for himself, and also to do what every other ghost of a famous man has hitherto been pitiably hampered in doing—namely, to express himself in *post-mortem* utterances which are not distressingly incompatible with his reputation." Thornton has no patience with those who call Sh. the sonneteer insincere. In his preliminary comments he writes: "The Spirit of William Shakespeare, sore vexed of them who say that in his *Sonnets* he writ not from the truth of his

heart but from the toyings of his brain, and that he devised but a feigned object to fit a feigned affection, herein maketh answer, renewing as best a shadow may that rhyme wherein he was more excellent in the living body." Twelve sonnets more or less imitating his in subject and phraseology follow. The *T. L. S.* reviewer (September 1, 1921, p. 560) commented: "We need not trouble to inquire whether Mr. Thornton's claim to be a medium between Shakespeare's spirit and the modern world is made lightly or in all seriousness. Certainly he has quite cunningly reproduced the Elizabethan manner, and technically the twelve sonnets . . . are neat and ingenious." He is "a journeyman of much ability." M. H. SPIELMANN (the same, October 27, 1921, p. 698) agrees that Thornton has caught "the Shakespearian manner *tout pur*, so happy is the rendering as regards both conception and phraseology," and he quotes further from the dust-wrapper (missing from the one copy I have seen): "If there be those who are still unconvinced, the present production may help them to conviction—in some direction. . . . It is what we might expect from an aggrieved Shakespeare—and the gentle reader is invited to consider it as final and authoritative as he would any other ghostly communication."

Other writers cast a split vote for autobiography and for fiction. EMIL PENNER (*Jahrbuch*, 1898, XXXIV, 411 f.) comments: one must admit the possibility that an actual basis may exist for the sonnet personages, but every hypothesis built on such a foundation is nothing but a hypothesis with no proof behind it. It may be true, says F. T. VISCHER (*Sh.-Vorträge*, 1899, I, 136), that individual sonnets are fictions; but the greater part of the sequence is a personal confession based chiefly on actual events, though with some admixture of imagination. So, too, in one of his numerous and not entirely consistent discussions WOLFF (*Sh.s Sonette*, 1903, pp. x-xiii) decides that the sonnets are partly descriptions of real events and feelings, partly imaginative. It cannot be doubted that the dark woman and the friend really existed and played important roles in Sh.'s life. HADOW's opinion is (ed. 1907, p. x) that "the bulk of the sonnets were written when a story suggesting that which they narrate may have actually occurred, and that Shakespeare may have used it with the same imaginative latitude with which he rewrote the history of King Lear. . . . That the events took place as they are here depicted is not a matter of possible belief." MORSBACH (*Jahrbuch*, 1908, XLIV, xiv) writes, "In Shakespeare's sonnets, all of which certainly are not to be regarded as fashionable poetry with invented themes and as mere poetic exercises, he has at times unmistakably given vivid expression to personal moods. But since we know nothing at all about his intimate relationships during the sonnet-period . . . , we cannot separate the true from the poetic." The sonnets have no value for a study of the mature Sh. and, at best, reproduce momentary moods, which cannot be considered predominant and of general validity for this period in his life. The romances that have been read into the sonnets "satisfy only the desire of our times for sensation." Of much the same mind is PIERCE (*Introduction to Sh.*, 1910, pp. 68-70): "Modern scholarship seems to feel more and more that we cannot take all their statements literally. . . . The majority . . . , at least, cannot be said to throw any light on Shakespeare's life"—a statement from which, in emulation of Lee, he specifically excludes 40-42, 110, 133, 134,

144. "To attempt to manufacture a biography of Shakespeare out of the *Sonnets*," SAINTSBURY (*C. H. E. L.*, 1910, V, 259) declares, "is to attempt to follow a will-o'-the-wisp," yet he admits that *some* truth is in the sequence. But "the fact that we have failed to identify and may never identify the friend, mistress, and rival poet," as E. S. BATES (*M. P.*, 1910, VIII, 106) well says, "is no sufficient evidence of their non-existence." DE BERZEVICZY (*Revue de Hongrie*, 1914, XIII, 180-183) elucidates his views by comparing the sonnets of Michelangelo and Sh. Neither owes his fame to his sonnets, which neither wished to publish. Both were inspired by Petrarchan models. Sh.'s were written in youth, Michelangelo's in old age; the former's are akin to his plays, the latter's to his sculpture and painting. "Both presented us with enigmas in their sonnets, but one may well say that these enigmas are more easily solved in Michelangelo than in Shakespeare." Both addressed poems to young men, the Italian a few, the Englishman many. Melancholy dominates each poet, but whereas Sh. is indifferent to religion and horrified at the thought of death, Michelangelo looks forward to death as a redemption, a final purification, a union with Christ. Michelangelo's sonnets are subjective, while "the avowals of Shakespeare's sonnets can only with difficulty be considered entirely so. . . . In addition to the classic villains of his plays, he has created enough admirably noble characters for posterity to refrain from judging him because of some sonnets of uncertain meaning."

Approaching in another way the problem he had discussed seven years earlier, MORSBACH (*Göttingen Nachrichten*, 1915, pp. 145-148) inquires: If the sonnets contain personal revelations, why did the men concerned in the 1640 *Poems* make no comment? Yet he leaves the door half open by saying (p. 163) that Thorpe's credible preface to Q implies that the sonnets "owe their existence to the stimulus of a friend or patron of Shakespeare and probably less to the poet's impulse to reveal the secrets of his heart."

ALDEN's comments (ed. 1916, p. x) on Lee are characteristically mild and judicious: "The reaction against the excesses of biographic interpretation has been increased by the studies of Sir Sidney Lee, and it seems clear that our understanding of the *Sonnets* can never be quite the same that it was before these studies revealed the extent and character of the sonnet writing of the Renaissance; yet . . . competent criticism is nearly unanimous in the view that Lee is too little disposed to realize the extent to which an artificial form may express a real experience. . . . Because a wedding ring is of itself insufficient proof of marital affection, it does not follow that one who wears a wedding ring is to be assumed to be married only in name." ROBERTSON (*Sh. and Chapman*, 1917, p. 12) rephrases an old idea. He "accepts the conclusion that a number . . . [of the sonnets]—it may be many—are autobiographical." But "that some were written on behalf of, or at the instance of, various personages, is the only theory by which a number seem to be made intelligible. . . . It is surely not difficult to imagine the most impersonal of all dramatists writing 'sugred sonnets for his private friends.'" CLUTTON-BROCK (*Essays on Books*, 1920, p. 17) thinks it certain "that many of the earlier ones were literary exercises and that many of the later were not." "From the sonnets" STOCKTON AXSON (*Rice Institute Pamphlet*, 1930, XVII, 14) "can learn nothing indisputable about the occurrences of Shakespeare's life because they tell either too little

or too much." The drama of the sonnets is emphasized by WOODBERRY (*Literary Essays*, 1920, pp. 269 f.): wearing an "autobiographical mask," the poet "seems transformed into his opposite, into the lyrical poet unlocking his own heart. . . . What is plain is the drama, what is obscure is only the basis of the drama, whether it be fact or convention, or mingled of both; whatever be the personal element, it is conceived, handled, developed dramatically, its truth is at bottom dramatic truth." YOUNG (*Sonnets of Sh.*, 1937, pp. 2 f.) reaches the non-committal decision that "whether the sonnets are autobiographical or purely products of the poetical imagination . . . they certainly tell a story, and . . . the story remains the same whether it is true or merely a romantic fiction." But WOLFGANG SCHMIDT (*Anglia*, 1938, LXII, 287 f.) thinks that Sh. "originally wished to demonstrate his mastery in the witty courtly mode of the sonnet. In his hands, however, the artificial form changed quickly to a noble vessel. . . . It is not very difficult to differentiate between the fashionable trifling and the heartfelt sincerity of the poet."

Meanwhile, the literary-exercise—or at least the non-autobiographical—theory has increased in favor till its proponents almost outnumber those of the personal theory. Many are far more uncompromising than Lee. CUMING WALTERS (*Mystery of Sh.'s Sonnets*, 1899, pp. 84 f., 88, 102) speaks of the sonnets as mere exercises, "dramatic exercises on given subjects," Sh.'s "diary of allegory and parables," "preliminary studies" for the plays. RUSDEN (*William Sh.*, 1903, p. 42 n.) concedes that a few may reveal Sh.'s "innermost feelings, but most of them are mere leaflets, thrown off carelessly." GENÉE (*William Sh.*, 1905, p. 454), reversing his earlier position (*Shakespeare*, 1872, p. 84), accepts Lee's decision. WÜLKER (*Geschichte der englischen Literatur*, 1906, I, 332) admits that "the alleged biographical matter is, for the most part, only an imitation of similar French, rarely Italian, models." LUCE (*Handbook*, 1906, pp. 82, 85, 88) can detect no personal revelation. The treatment of love, friendship, and the like is "tinged with convention, if not wholly conventional." Some of the lyrics "were exercises; some were written in friendly rivalry; some rang changes on themes present to the poet in his other work; some were 'occasional' pieces; but many were either adapted or composed so that within their form of artifice they half revealed and half concealed a soul of intense reality."

NEILSON and THORNDIKE (*Facts*, 1913, pp. 48, 88, 190) acquire from the sonnets "no knowledge of Shakespeare's personal affairs, and only a meager basis even for gossip as to some of his experiences with men and women"; "it is hardly necessary to urge that Shakespeare was capable of profound and passionate utterance under the impulse of imagination alone"; "at their worst, the sonnets may have been only literary exercises on conventional themes, but at their best they are surely both superb poetry and the result of genuine emotion." WOLFF (*E. S.*, 1916, XLIX, 189), now an ardent student of Petrarchanism, concludes that "nothing can really be gleaned from the sonnets concerning the external life of the poet. As we know from other sources he had a patron, and he may also have had a mistress. But everything beyond that, and especially everything he says about these two beings and about himself, is shaped out of poetic convention. Should the biographer on that ac-

count negligently pass these poems by? Certainly not. Though they offer no material for the life of the author, they offer all the more for his artistry."¹ "Wolff's general ideas are just," SCOTT (*Sonnets élisabéthains*, 1929, p. 238) decides, and they are taken over as a whole by PEARSON (*Elizabethan Love Conventions*, 1933, pp. 252-258).

H. MUTSCHMANN (*Beiblatt*, 1916, XXVII, 268) is skeptical about the value of the sonnets for their author's biography: "We shall be able to arrive at no unanimity . . . with regard to the question, did Shakespeare describe actual events in the sonnets? Little can be done with apodictical pronouncements: these remain personal opinion and cannot convince one who resists. One thinks of Goethe, whose poems, according to his own statement, are 'fragments of a great confession,' and who yet, with the most ravishing powers of conviction, describes lyrical situations which have no basis in actual, or rather physical, experience, but are supported by stimuli from literature or other external sources. Shakespeare certainly experienced much, and through his extraordinarily sympathetic spirit could feel intensively spiritual conditions foreign to himself; he too, like Goethe, wrestled with these experiences and dealt with the problems of life in the form of poetry. I do not believe that one can separate the sonnets from the narrative poems and these from the plays. The same questions, the same conflicts, the same problems recur in all three categories. We will never be able to learn from a study of the works alone, however, where the experience of his own physical life is to be separated from the life of the imagination. Only the opposite road is open: if we only knew the correct dates for events in the poet's life, then perhaps we could trace back much in his work to real experience."

H. J. BRIDGES (*Our Fellow Sh.*, 1916, pp. 272-277) fully endorses Lee's pronouncements on imitation in the sonnets, which there is no reason to suppose are concerned with genuine events. They are, instead, dramatic, although "it would be . . . folly to affirm positively that there is nothing at all reminiscent of personal experiences in" them. Much more categorically CROSLAND (*English Sonnet*, 1917, pp. 198, 211, 213) brushes aside objections. "Shakespeare did NOT unlock his heart in the *Sonnets*, any more than he may be said to have unlocked his heart in *Romeo and Juliet*, or *Hamlet*, or *Lear*, or *Othello*. We contend further that he had no 'fair male friend' and no 'dark, naughty woman-love' such as the *Sonnets* shadow forth and, indeed, definitely portray [*sic*]; " 'the story of the sonnets,' such as it is, was evolved fortuitously out of the writing and sequence of the pieces, and the sonnets were not written

¹ In a later article in *Die neueren Sprachen*, 1920, XXVIII, 193-203, WOLFF describes the young Sh. as writing his poems and sonnets under the influence of the Petrarchan philosophy of life. "The sonnets," he says (p. 196), "contain no reality in the generally accepted sense of the word, but likewise no fiction, if by fiction one understands an arbitrarily invented product of the imagination." Compare his *Renaissance in der englischen Literatur*, 1928, pp. 76 f.: People have read a novel into the sonnets. To do so is to be unhistorical: there is no riddle of the sonnets, but only Petrarchanism. What Sh. sees, he sees through Petrarch's spectacles. The triangle situation is developed wholly within the poet's imagination, with no reference to an actual friend or mistress.

out of a story, personal or impersonal." "Only the scholars know or read the *Sonnets* for a sequence or for a history. Ordinary people content themselves with the most beautiful and most human of them, and skip the rest." To such assurance there is really no polite manner of replying. Assurance is seldom lacking in students of Sh., and POEL's temperate remark (*Prominent Points*, 1919, Table I) that the autobiographical theory is "unproved" no doubt owes its brevity to limitations of space. With more detail ORD (*Chaucer & the Rival Poet*, 1921, p. 14) holds that Sh. "has written, on different occasions, sonnets referring to many different subjects and people, and has not combined them with any design to work out a revelation, but has put them down as representing his emotions from time to time, without any definite connection between them all"; and MATHEW (*Image of Sh.*, 1922, p. 108) describes the sonnets as written "in varying moods. The moods tell us nothing about his private affairs, for no Lyrical Poem can ever be taken as a statement of truth." Just at this time (1922), also, SIR FREDERICK POLLOCK was telling his American correspondent, Justice O. W. Holmes (*Holmes-Pollock Letters*, 1941, II, 103): "Nor am I greatly interested in the puzzle of the *Sonnets*. W. S. would surely not risk a scandal even 'among his private friends' and must have been careful so to embroider the substratum of fact, whatever it was, that they could not make one."

HERFORD (*Sketch*, 1923, p. 56) warmly praises Lee's researches in the themes, language, and general sources of the Elizabethan sonneteers. He decides that the "derivative character of a vast majority of the sonnets does much, if not quite so much as Lee thinks, to invalidate whatever claim they make (and many made no such claim) to be outpourings of sincere emotion, to be taken at their face value." F. G. STOKES (*Dictionary*, 1924, p. 303) assures his readers that "the autobiographical importance of the *Sonnets* is largely to be discounted." TUCKER (ed. 1924, p. xxxvi) believes it "a mistake either to treat every piece alike as being concerned with one and the same object of affection, or to regard the whole series as being an equally spontaneous and emotionally consistent record of the poet's relations with that object." Doubts and agnosticism grow by what they feed on. In a challenging and stimulating essay written in 1924 (*New Essays*, 1927, pp. 97-116), NOYES deplores the energy that has been wasted in trying to read Sh.'s life into his lyrics. "If a thousandth part" of it (p. 101) had been spent on the sonnets "simply as poetry, we should begin to understand the mind and spirit of Shakespeare the man far better than by any other means. . . . [P. 105] If ever great poems were, in phrase after phrase, not only derivative but imitative, these sonnets of Shakespeare are both. Their sincerity . . . is the sincerity of all great art. . . . [P. 106] Many of the sonnets were offshoots from the more sustained work" of Sh. Various single lines and couplets were written for *Venus*, and then later used in sonnets. 126, for example, is (p. 108; see also I, 320) "a collection of stray clinching couplets" from the earlier poem "rather awkwardly fitted together." Again, 99 was originally intended for use in *Venus*, and a new first line (p. 110; see also I, 245 f.) "had to be prefixed to couple it with its predecessor and to explain what it was all about." 129 is (p. 113; see also I, 330) "a pendant" to *Lucrece*, lines 708-721. Many others (p. 114) "are direct imitations of contemporary work," and "therefore demonstrably art, not autobiography." Noyes

thinks it possible to agree with both Wordsworth and Browning (p. 116): "With this key, the key of the sonnet, Shakespeare did, in the only sense understood by the poet, unlock his heart. But he did not unlock his autobiography." "It is very possible," writes COWLING (*Preface*, 1925, p. 39), "that many of the sonnets are mere literary exercises, composed in a period when sonnet writing was a fashionable craze." "Many," to be sure (p. 77), appear to be sincere and personal, yet (p. 80) it is "most probable . . . that Shakespeare's sonnets are a feigned expression of personal feeling, and not autobiography." The public is usually wrong, T. S. ELIOT (*Nation and Athenaeum*, 1927, XL, 666) remarks, in its efforts to read autobiography into sonnets like Sh.'s: "this autobiography is written by a foreign man in a foreign tongue, which can never be translated." JOHN BAILEY (*Shakespeare*, 1929, pp. 59 f.) calls it a "mere waste of time" to try to identify the persons of the sonnets "because no material exists for identifying them, and it is even possible that they were not real persons at all." He says that Lee has shown all to be "common figures" of "the fashionable sonneteering exercises of the time." "It is not merely contemporary practice in the matter of sonnets which tells us not to expect to find a Life of Shakespeare in the Sonnets. It is the nature of poetry itself. Poetry is imagination, not fact."

MACKAIL (*Approach to Sh.*, 1930, p. 111) urges—though vainly—that the sonnets should be read as poetry, not "as vehicles of problems, of philosophies, or of obsessions. . . . The Sonnets are not an autobiography. . . . How much of his own actual experience lies behind the Sonnets, or how little, we do not know, and it is as idle as fruitless to inquire." Such, on the whole, is the verdict very well set forth by KELLNER in 1933 (*E. S.*, LXVIII, 64, 79 f.). Sh.'s contemporaries and his readers in the next two centuries regarded each sonnet as an independent poem with no reference to autobiography. Since 1800 all have been studied as "a partial confession." But they are "neither a coherent love story nor a *roman à clef*." Though the sonnets to the friend have "genuine feeling, stylized to the taste of the day," yet an interpreter "cannot escape guesses and contradictions as soon as he steps on the shaky ground of biographical interpretation." What is needed is to stop, for a little while, our search for allusions to people and things and to try to understand each sonnet in itself and for itself. Kellner is unquestionably correct in his assertion (pp. 57 f.) that the mere language of Sh. is seldom understood by readers, and that the most important factor in the sonnets is "the meaning of Shakespeare's words." But surely he is too sanguine in expecting the public "to practise a little philology." On his side is KNIGHTS (*Scrutiny*, 1934, III, 138, 147): "The attempt to isolate the original stimulus . . . is not only hazardous, it is irrelevant," and "critics who reconstruct a Shakespeare hopelessly and uncritically subjugated by a particular experience must be quite deaf to variations of tone." RIDLEY (*William Sh.*, 1936, pp. 13 f.) abandons all attempts to solve the puzzle, and is willing to leave it "to each reader to determine for himself how far they are interlocked with the plays and how far they illuminate Shakespeare's life." STRICKER (*Jahrbuch*, 1936, LXXII, 85) comments on Sh.'s employment of "many poetical stylistic devices" in the sonnets to exercise himself in literary techniques; and two years later CADOUX (*Shakespearean Selves*, 1938, pp. 168-170, 176) rejects auto-

biographical interpretation on the old basis that the sonnet story, if true, would make its teller ridiculous and contemptible.

If the past and present are a criterion, each reader will continue to lock or unlock Sh.'s heart as he sees fit. But one could wish the judicious words of KITTREDGE (*S. A. B.*, 1936, XI, 172 f.)¹ to be more widely known and pondered: "Baffled in their attempts to discover the undiscoverable, . . . inquisitive spirits have retired from their assaults upon the dramas of Shakespeare, and fallen furiously, in unabashed discomfiture, upon the defenceless Sonnets. Defenceless indeed! for what lies so bare of protection and concealment as a poor little lyric poem in which, both from its very nature and from the conventions that attend it, the author must appear to 'unlock his heart'? A sonnet (if it would not fail of its purpose, would not falsify the end for which it comes into being) must seem to be veracious and actual; it must seem to express authentic emotion, and (most pernicious of qualities!) it must speak in the first person. In a word, a sonnet must be either patently artificial, and then it is *bad*—or *good*, and then it sounds like autobiography. There is no escape; a good sonnet appears to be a confession. These are terms from which not even the supreme genius can be exempt. He must either refrain, or run the risk of a literal (that is, a personal) interpretation. It follows, then, that the testimony of the sonnets must ever remain ambiguous. Nothing can prove them autobiographical except the discovery of outside evidence that they accord with facts of the poet's life; and no such evidence is forthcoming." In similar vein SPENCER (*Art and Life*, 1940, p. 35) brings the discussion to a temporary close: "The Sonnets puzzle intrigues everyone—scholars, brilliant amateurs, not-so-bright amateurs, charlatans, and cranks. Even if it continues to attract any number of busy or idle minds for another three hundred years, we may be confident it will remain unsolved—unless external evidence is turned up. For no better (and no madder) brains will be applied to the internal evidence than have already tackled it. If new documents are discovered, it will be they, and not the sonnets, that will give us the facts. The sonnets will only tell us how Shakespeare felt about the facts." Three decades earlier J. C. COLLINS (*Saturday Review*, 1898, LXXXV, 287) had made almost an identical pronouncement: "Whether they are to be regarded as autobiographical, as dramatic studies, as a mixture of both, as a collection of miscellaneous poems, as written to order for others, or as mere exercises in the sonnet circle, is alike uncertain. . . . On mere conjecture and mere hypothesis is based every attempt to solve their mystery. If certainty about them can ever be arrived at it can only be attained by evidence of which as yet we have not even an inkling."

The foregoing summary has neglected many worthy persons (possibly only the tenth muse, ten times more in worth than the old nine, could do them justice) who have unlocked Sh.'s heart with keys of individual or eccentric design and manufacture. Space and inclination are lacking to do justice to all the esoteric, metaphysical, or non-Stratfordian general interpretations, some of them ingenious, others preposterous, nearly all (if one is in the mood

¹ Reprinted, with slight changes, from his *Shakspeare*, 1916, pp. 51 f.

for it) entertaining. A number are referred to elsewhere in this volume, but the following possibly deserve some melodious tears here.

In Germany BARNSTORFF (*Key*, 1862, pp. 13 f.) discovered that "the subjects of the poet's muse . . . is [*sic*] no Earl of Southampton, no Earl of Pembroke, no Queen Elizabeth, no Mrs. Varnon [*sic*]*—no corporeal friend, no corporeal mistress, but Genius and the Drama.*"¹ In 1-126 there is "an appeal addressed by his mortal to his immortal man," in 127-152 "he gives us his innermost thoughts upon the Drama or his Art." Barnstorff reprints (p. 212) but does not discuss 153 and 154. His interpretation, still usually mentioned with ridicule, reads like dry, established fact when compared with various later sonnet-keys. It was quickly followed by an English revelation. HERAUD (*Shakspeare*, 1865, pp. 23-26; see p. 272, below) developed a theory he had earlier enunciated in 1862: that some of the lyrics "are addressed to a supposed celibate," and celebrate "his Divine Ideal." In the later sonnets "the Man has become a Messiah, and the Woman the Church. The former retains his fairness, but the latter is depicted as black. She is, in fact, the black but comely bride of Solomon. . . . Shakspeare parabolically opposed the Mariolatry of his time to the purer devotion of the Word of God, which it was the mission of his age to inaugurate."

To esoteric interpretations of this kind America has contributed more than her share. Thus HITCHCOCK (*Remarks*, 1865) explained the sonnets as a species of hermetic writing. Love, as used by Sh. (p. 11), "had not a mortal being for its object, but an irrepresentable spirit of beauty, the true source of artistic *births*." The sonnets deal (p. 22) with "the Beautiful in the Platonic sense." It has (pp. 36 f.) a "masculine . . . side," or reason, and a "feminine side," or affections and passions. So (pp. 284 f.) in 152 Sh. himself is "the *bed* in which the ideal, the Muse, had impressed upon him the conviction of her truth and power," her "bed-vow," which Sh. says has been broken. The last two sonnets (p. 47) have "a very mystical allusion to the Mosaic law. . . . In the 153d . . . *Cupid* signifies love, in a religious sense; the *maid of Dian* is a *virgin* truth of nature; the *cold valley-fountain* is the letter of the law—called a cold well in the 154th Sonnet: and truth, we all know, is said to be at the bottom of a well"—which recalls Shelley's famous remark to Trelawny after his unsuccessful swimming lesson. BUDD (*Sh.'s Sonnets*, 1868, pp. 5-17) gives, from Philadelphia, about the most incoherent and cloudy discussion yet written. "It is not the compass of these remarks to definitely explain" the plan of the sonnets, "but simply to demonstrate that . . . [they] explain themselves"! Budd seems to say that those addressed to Sh.'s "Rose" represent "no other than the soul materialized, and they are thus applicable to mankind generally, individually, and to the poet in particular. In thus materializing his soul and addressing himself, he has followed the highest point of literary etiquette,"—but Budd's meaning (if any) frankly has escaped me.

Hardly in the same class as the foregoing is the explanation of RICHARD SIMPSON (*Introduction*, 1868, p. 2) that "the sonnets alone are purely personal." In them "it is the poet who speaks; it is himself whom he describes." Yet

¹ The English translation, apparently issued with Barnstorff's approval, varies in some details from the original (*Schlüssel*, 1860, pp. 12 f.).

(pp. 57, 75) "interpreted biographically of the poet and his friend, the story is shocking"; and it is "much more natural to take the framework of the Sonnets as a mere imagination, devised to display the progress of love to the best advantage," though "multitudes of the details may be true." First of all (p. 38), the sonnets are an exposition of the Platonic philosophy of love, "and only in the second intention biographical or historical, and therefore using real events in complete subordination to the philosophical ideas." The effect of Simpson's discussion is manifested (see also p. 131, above) in CONRAD (*Archiv*, 1879, LXI, 198): "Shakspeare appears as an eminent Platonist especially in his sonnets of friendship. Next to Michelangelo's love sonnets they are the very noblest fruit that Platonic philosophy has borne in the literature of the world. An interpretation of the sonnets, especially of the sonnets of friendship, will therefore continually have to seek support in the Platonic philosophy of love, if it is to convey to our age the same ideas which Shakespeare and his educated contemporaries associated with them." J. A. SYMONDS (*Academy*, 1873, IV, 43) also admits some preference for "the very subtle hypothesis supported by Simpson"; and it was endorsed, with slight modifications, by the Baconian WIGSTON (*New Study*, 1884, pp. 40-161). BROTHER AZARIAS (or P. F. MULLANY, *Phases of Thought*, 1892, p. 188), accepting every detail of Simpson's, remarks: "The love of Shakespeare is to all seeming certainly of the earth, earthy. But in his day nearly everything in sonnet form was expressive of Platonic love, Platonic sentiment, and Platonic allegory. Shakespeare caught up this spirit, and it may safely be asserted that he never would have given his sonnets to the world were they not capable of a philosophical meaning which redeems their occasional grossness." BOWDEN (*Religion of Sh.*, 1899, pp. 214-241) summarizes the Simpson theory and heartily approves it, and approval is likewise given by FILON (*Revue des deux mondes*, 1901, 5th series, II, 814-817). BRADLEY (*Shakespearean Tragedy*, 1904, p. 264 n.) acknowledges that Simpson's Platonic theory is valuable, though overemphasized. On the other hand, in it RALLI (*History of Shakespearean Criticism*, 1932, I, 322 f.) finds Sh. "overridden by a theory," which "interests rather as expounding the philosophy of the Renaissance sonneteers than as a criticism of Shakespeare." But the eminent names of ERNST CASIRER (*Platonische Renaissance*, 1932, p. 82) and PAUL SHOREY (*Platonism*, 1938, pp. 179 f.) are ranged at least partly on its side. The famous German philosopher, unfortunately, dismisses the sonnets all too briefly: "Shakespeare . . . is under the spell of a definite poetic-philosophical tradition; even his love lyrics show that mixture of Platonism and Petrarchanism which is characteristic of the style of his age." Shorey writes: "The sonnets ring the changes on the idea of the *Symposium* that a man's offspring or his books are his immortality . . . , and they contain touches of what may be loosely styled Platonic idealism." SCOTT (*Sonnets élisabéthains*, 1929, pp. 232-234), however, presents some objections: "Shakespeare's sonnets do not contain an exposition of Platonic theories, but a small number of sonnets need to be explained by those theories. The friend of Shakespeare becomes ideal beauty, the typification of beauty. The poet describes him [105.9 f., 13 f.] by recalling Platonic ideas. . . . The friend represents the beautiful, the true, and the good. The poet's love cannot be called 'idolatry,' since his subject is nothing but the

Beautiful, the True, and the Good, which dwell in the young man's person. One will notice the slow transformation of the Platonic theory, which affirms that every beautiful thing is the shadow of perfect beauty. . . . The poet does not always employ the Platonic vocabulary exactly, and certain critics have believed that the sonnets which contain the words 'truth' and 'beauty,' 'shadow' and 'substance,' contain no philosophic allusion. The use of these terms had doubtless, however, been suggested by the current philosophy, even though the words did not have their full philosophic signification."

A further German contribution on the order of Barnstorff's was announced in KARPFF's *Tò ti ἦν εἶναι*, 1869; namely, that the friend of 1-126 is the poet's spiritual being, the dark woman of 127-154 his art and muse. The mention of the "conceit of loue" in 108.13 proves that love in the sonnets rests on abstraction and imagination. The child which the friend is urged in 1-17 to beget is *Hamlet*, a play which (see 104) took three years to write.¹ GOEDEKE (*Deutsche Rundschau*, 1877, X, 399-409) gave another solution of the mystery. The sonnets are purely dramatic. There is, for example, an obvious parallel between *Love's Labor's Lost* and 127, 130-132, 147, so obvious that the latter may actually be further effusions of Berowne's. 1-17 remind Goedeke of *Venus*, whence it is a short step to his assumption that Sh. planned a sonnet sequence on the myth of Sappho and Phaon; "it is not difficult to discover twice fourteen thou-sonnets" in which Sappho addresses her lover. 37 and 38 are directed to Queen Elizabeth. Fourteen others are poetical missives to the poet's family, recounting the story of his life from the time he left Stratford for London up to the day when he decides to return. People seeking this highly interesting tale should read—the order is Goedeke's—36, 44, 45, 97, 29, 48, 50, 51, 122, 111, 108, 52, 109, 110, and should observe that of these fourteen 52 and 108 are addressed to Hamnet Sh., twelve to the poet's wife.

The explanation of LEGIS (*N. & Q.*, April 7, 1877, p. 262) is that "the sonnets [1-126] are the intellectual life of Shakspeare told under two forms of material love. They are a defence of poetry and of the stage. They are an ever-living acknowledgment left by him to the world, and to the spirit of the world, of the 'great gift' that had been accorded him."

It was reserved for an anonymous writer in *Blackwood's*, 1884 (CXXXV, 759 f.), to ascertain that "the theme of the Sonnets is no vulgar, sensual, or even Platonic love, but is the love which is spiritual, heavenly, and divine"; "these songs of the new life of Shakespeare begin with that which is natural, they advance to that which is spiritual, and they ascend to that which is eternal." Sh., like Dante, "speaks of a love which is above change, humour, or caprice." The goodness and truth of God are "his invariable theme." Then in 1886 W. D. O'CONNOR (*Hamlet's Note-Book*, pp. 51 f.) announced that Raleigh wrote the sonnets, and that they "are addressed to or inspired by at least four persons,—a beautiful young man of stainless life; a beautiful young man who is a thorough libertine; a woman so fair that the lily and the red and white rose are brought into compare with her complexion; and a woman so unquestionably brunette that she is called black." Very different is DOWNING's summary (*Long Desiderated Knowledge*, 1892, p. 32): "As spiritual love

¹ A summary of Karpf's book is given by ULRICI, *Jahrbuch*, 1870, V, 335-340.

is expressed in the Sonnets to Mr. W. H. the type of Beauty,¹ so sensual love is expressed in Sonnets 127-154 to the Dark Lady, a vivid type . . . of Desire. At first the poet wishes to be wholly free from the sensual love; but finally he accepts the conjunction of Mr. W. H. and the Dark Lady, that is, of the spiritual and the sensual in sexual love." In a later work (*Messiahship of Sh.*, 1901, pp. 99-101) the explanation is given somewhat more directly: 1-126 are Sh.'s "communings with his ideas of Beauty, Truth, Virtue, Art and his own genius," 127-154 his "communings with his ideas of Love. . . . To talk about Beauty in a perfect form of Beauty, that is the problem solved by *The Sonnets*."

The blind New Yorker, DUNNING (*Genesis*, 1897, pp. xiii f., xviii f. n.), liked both Barnstorff's and Hitchcock's interpretations, which resemble his own. In brief, the friend is Sh.'s "personified poetic Ideal," "the pattern of the poet's work, which . . . advances daily." Even the dark lady sonnets have a "paramount reference" to him, for "he is still their spiritual centre." Dunning's book was mentioned with considerable sympathy by PORTER (*Poet-Lore*, 1897, IX, 610-613).

J. M. (*Sh. Self-Revealed*, 1904, pp. 6 f.), who is sure (see also his *Ben Jonson on Sh.'s Sonnets*, 1914, pp. 14-21) that in his commendatory verses to the 1623 Sh. Folio Jonson discusses the sonnets at length, informs us that the "two loves" of 144, "figured by a man and a woman, are respectively Love of Beauty and Love of Fame." The idea "that man is the better able to appreciate, and is more willing to sacrifice himself for, the Ideal, while woman is more inclined to consider Profit, or Fortune . . . is the basis of the allegory of the Sonnets: the Profit or Fortune which is supposed to result from Love of Beauty being Fame." Hence (p. 181 n.), Sh. "himself is the 'master-mistress' of his passion."

DE MONTMORENCY (*Contemporary Review*, 1912, CI, 739) explains: "The Sonnets are an allegory in which the poet is the spectator of Eternity, 'the Friend' is Life and Goodness, and 'the Dark Lady' is Death and Evil. . . . [Hence, they are] the key that unlocks the poet's soul, and brings to view the sublime spiritual motives that inspired his life's work." A somewhat more original suggestion is BLATT's (*M. P.*, 1913, XI, 135-140): Sh. was paid to write dramatic sonnets for old Will H., a "lame, insignificant, old man," whose friend, young Will, himself a poet, robs him of his mistress. Though this theory deprives the sonnets of any value as an autobiographical record of Sh., "it also erases the stains upon Shakespeare's character . . . stains of sycophancy, of querulousness, even of homo-sexuality," meanwhile reducing "the sonnets from genuine expressions of feeling to mere hack writing."

Perverted ingenuity could scarcely go farther than in FORBIS's *Shakespearean Enigma*, 1924. He describes the sonnets as Sh.'s account of his dipsomania: "his genius, or art, loved and demanded wine, while his moral nature despised and rejected it" (p. 7). Such is the theme even of 1-18 (p. 9), in which Sh. addresses himself ("the marriage advised is the espousal of, surrender to, Wine, and the progeny to be begotten are . . . the products of the

¹ [In *Great Pan Lives*, 1892, DOWNING gave a detailed account of "the Evolution of the Ideal observable in Sonnets 20-126."]

mind,—poetry”), and of 20 (pp. 34 f.) where Wine is his “master-mistress.”¹ It was with such outbursts as the foregoing in mind that LYTTON STRACHEY (in Rylands, *Words and Poetry*, 1928, pp. xiv f.) made his facetious contribution: “If an allegory must be found in those baffling documents, why should not this be the solution to it? One can fancy that the beautiful youth was merely a literary expression for the classical vocabulary, while the dark lady personified the Saxon one. Their relations, naturally enough, were strained, yet intimate. . . . The theory is offered gratis to the next commentator on the Sonnets. There have been many more far-fetched.” Almost immediately one equally far-fetched was presented by B. R. WARD (*Poetry and the Play*, 1929-30, XIII [No. 87], 19-30). Without even intimating his well-known adherence to Oxford as “Sh.,” Ward solemnly announces that from a study of Bray’s 1925 rearrangement of the sonnets (see pp. 104 f., above) he recognizes “clearly for the first time since the days when they passed from hand to hand in manuscript among Shakespeare’s friends that their primary object is the expression of the poet’s home life in a series of dramatic lyrics.” Accordingly, the lyrics on the fair youth were “written in the nursery and addressed to a baby boy.” The sequence *à la* Bray begins with 20, where Sh. “receives intimation of the birth of his son,” or master-mistress. Seven “raptures” follow, and, to omit other details, the poet soon begins to fear that his son won’t marry and hence (as if prattling verse lullabies in the nursery) he tries to direct the infant’s mind to matrimony. Again, Sh., “growing old and enfeebled by ill-health, dreads the thought of death, which will separate him from his boy.” The dark woman is the poet’s wife, and when in 73.5-8 she announces that the baby’s bedtime has come, “there is nothing more to be said.” But in 133 and 134 she and the poet indulge in “Family bickering about Baby,” while in all the other sonnets the subject is “Baby-worship” that shows how “the Poet’s household evidently revolved round King Baby.” No more astounding explanation has ever been printed,² though of course there is no telling what else the human brain has silently evolved. Ward’s picture of a baby-worshipping household would at least seem faintly more plausible if Sh. and Anne Hathaway were the protagonists. For all his essay says, they are.

Tired with all these, from these would I be gone; but for completeness I mention BEATRICE BARNSTORFF FRAME (*W. Sh.’s Lied*, 1931), presumably a granddaughter of the earlier Barnstorff, who calls (p. 11) the sonnets “an autobiography, in which the struggle of a seeker for God is reflected; everything abstract becomes real experience, the experience of a man who feels and struggles and suffers even as we.” God (pp. 14 f.) “is for the author of the sonnets the epitome of perfection, perfect divinity. Again and again we meet in the sonnets the expression ‘beauty.’ But according to Plato beauty is ‘perfect divinity.’” The sonnets are a confession, written for the poet, not for

¹ Apprehensive readers may wish to be reminded of A. A. KERN’s decision (“Sh. and Drunkenness,” *Randolph-Macon Bulletin*, volume XII, 1925) that (p. 2), “though by no means a total abstainer or at all averse to using drunkenness as a source of humor, he [Sh.] was yet opposed to excessive drinking.”

² It is accepted and retold with flourishes by PERCY ALLEN (*Case for Edward de Vere*, 1930, pp. 151-199).

outsiders. Sh. obscured his intentions because as one of Elizabeth's vassals he had to submit to the domination of the Church of England. The poems, then, display his personal inner life. In the first sonnets (p. 17) Sh. "wrestles with the decision to marry Beauty, so that a son may grow from this marriage. Out of this Platonic-mystical union he lets a son develop, to whom he gradually subordinates himself. In the subsequent development of the sonnets, the son more and more receives the stamp of Christian mysticism. He becomes the 'beloved,' 'the master-mistress'; yet, though an adjunct to the poet, he remains united with his mother, Beauty. The intimate union of these three is celebrated in the sonnets." All of which, one may decide, is worthy to rank with Barnstorff's own "key."

Of a different and more metaphysical kind are the pronouncements of MAX DEUTSCHBEIN (*Jahrbuch*, 1933, LXIX, 12-14), who sees in the sonnets "most clearly and most unequivocally the characteristics of cosmism. Because of their common philosophy of life, they receive their internal unity through it; indeed they are, in a certain degree, urgencies drawn from the spirit of cosmism. The inner union of the poet with his noble friend and patron becomes a representation of the cosmos. The friend, regarded as a microcosm, becomes for the poet the symbol and the incarnation of the universe. Beauty, apprehended through the *amore rationale*, is the eternal value closely connected with truth, interpreted as genuineness. The true and genuine being of the cosmos reveals itself in beauty, even as, contrariwise, beauty is only beauty so long as it is based on genuineness and truth. The poet himself is possessed of a holy love for these representations of the cosmos. But this human cosmos, like every other, is made dubious by time, especially by change and death. These the poet seeks to obviate; therefore he asks the friend to immortalize his beauty through offspring. But then his verse, like a *documentum aere perennius*, is to triumph over all transitoriness and time and is to make known the beauty of his friend to future ages. A second force, however, is inimical to the cosmos. This is the force of Fortune. . . . The power of Fortune, malevolently opposed to the love of the two men, appears in many forms in Shakespeare's sonnets: be it in the lowly position of the poet himself, be it in the emergence of a poetic rival, or in the spatial separation of the two lovers. The rule of Fortune exerts itself even more strongly in the infidelity of the beloved man. And so the poet sees his love threatened from all sides by the great powers, Time and Fortune. To them he opposes the truth, genuineness, and constancy of his own love, which is enduring, eternal, unchangeable. It alone endures in the face of the malevolent powers. Thus the poet can exclaim: 'Love's not Time's fool' (116.9). Thus 'true love' and 'constancy' form a close union (105.6). Truth remains the highest value ruling the existence of the individual as well as the crowd. Beauty, on the other hand, recedes more and more in importance, since often enough, worthless things possess a sort of external beauty (54), which is exposed too strongly to mutability and transitoriness. In opposition to the attempts of his rivals, who celebrate the merits of his friend in exuberant rhetoric, the poet declares that truth is his weapon (cf. 82):

'Thou truly fair wert truly sympathized
In true plain words by thy true-telling friend.'

Similarly in 21. . . . Now in contrast to the love for the friend there appears in the sonnets the personality of the dark lady. Here the driving force is not love, but lust. She lacks true beauty. Nor does she possess truth, but rather 'falsehood' (137 and 138). And where the union of two beings rests only on lust, it is doomed to destruction. Nowhere is mutability so strongly revealed as in sensual enjoyment (129), and nowhere is the influence of Fortune so great as it is in this instance, since the presence of 'true love' is wanting. The end is chaos, not cosmos."

The Baconians disagree among themselves fully as much as members of the orthodox school. A few have already been mentioned. Among others WILLIAM THOMSON (*On Renaissance Drama*, 1880) announced that (p. 112) the sonnets were "written by Bacon, in 1600, for a friend to read to the Queen, and thereby win back her regard for her offending truant Essex, when the 'lord of my love' lay under his last eclipse"; that (p. 129) "silly commenters," declaring the poet's mistress to be dark in features, have missed the point, for it was Elizabeth's "mind and will, not her complexion, that was dark"—dark toward Essex; and that (p. 130) the "sweet boy" often referred to is Cupid. In the next year CATHARINE F. A. WINDLE, of Philadelphia (*Address to the New Sh. Society*, p. 3) revealed "that the KEY to the running allegory involved in the dramas is contained in the *mystery of the sonnets*." She resolved the mystery by (p. 44) "proof . . . of a singular nature—so singular, indeed, that it can only address itself to the highest order of minds." Windle, accordingly, soars too high for the present chronicler. She modestly underrated (p. 45) her discovery in the sonnets of "a key to the under-reading of the plays" as "a realization of the deepest reach of sympathetic intuition of which the human intellect and soul are capable—only short of that attained by the immortal dramatist [Bacon] himself." HOSMER (*Bacon and Sh. in the Sonnets*, 1887, p. 9), barring qualifications, said that "the Sonnets were undoubtedly written [by Bacon] for the purpose of conveying to future ages the true history of the dramas." His "key" makes *My Love* stand for the plays, *My Friend* for Sh., *I, me*, and so on for Bacon in person, *Myself* for Bacon as author, *My Mistress* for Tragedy. CONSTANCE M. POTT (*Baconiana*, August, 1893, p. 65; compare her *Did Francis Bacon*, etc., 2d ed., 1893, part II, p. viii) described the sequence as a "bridal song, in praise of the union . . . of truth and beauty, or . . . art and nature, philosophy and poetry, mind and spirit," and so on. To T. S. E. DIXON (*Francis Bacon*, 1895, p. 335), however, "one, and yet twain; present, and yet absent; owning, and yet dispossessed; exalted, and yet unhonored; seemingly indifferent, and yet fondly appreciative; suffering the bitterness of deprivation, and nevertheless finding solace in the separation; such was the turmoil . . . [that] is the one continual theme of the *Sonnets*, their unifying bond, the *motive* and the burden of their song."

HÄFKER's explanation (*Was sagt Sh.?*, 1896, pp. 94 f.) is that the dark woman, "in contrast to the spiritual world, the world of ideas, is 'reality'; in contrast to artistic creation, 'every-day life,' 'earthly pleasure.' In brief, she is reality, nature, history, with whom the poet's genius, his better self, his imagination, lives in fruitful intercourse, whose children are the 'works of art.'" "Sh." (Bacon) confesses "that the hussy, 'lust of the senses' and 'world of the senses,' held him in chains, so that his sensual, carnal part al-

ways sought to drag him away from 'his friend,' his 'Genius.'" And so he was happy when his friend, his genius, his imagination, cohabited with her to create the gifts of his beauty. "The true meaning of the Sonnets," DUGGAN (*Fair, Kind, and True*, 1896, pp. 6 f.) discloses, "is to define and relate the history of the Plays, and other facts connected with the personal history of the Poet—told in the Esoteric or Acroamatic method of delivery." So "the friend . . . is the alter-ego of the Poet." G. JAMES (*Francis Bacon in the Sonnets*, 1900, p. 2) finds the sequence "mainly an apotheosis of Learning, of Knowledge and of . . . [Bacon's] hidden work the Plays." BUCKE (*Cosmic Consciousness*, 1901, pp. 128, 149) explained that the author (Bacon) of 1-126 "had the Cosmic Sense and that these sonnets were addressed to it." Of 127-154 he says nothing, possibly because they show earthy, or fleshly, sense. BEGLEY (*Is It Sh.?*, 1903, pp. 190, 249) "decidedly" takes "the autobiographical view" of the sonnets, but would "not be surprised if some of them were written by Bacon for Southampton or Herbert to send to their lady-loves." "They are largely addressed," BATCHELOR rejoins (*Francis Bacon*, 1912, pp. 70 f.), "to an eidolon of inner consciousness, and in some verses have no real objective meaning, but are a mere joy of language." The illumination cast in a naughty world by EAGLE (*New Light*, 1916, pp. 13 f.) is that the poet (Bacon) "is merely soliloquising, and that they [the sonnets] should be read as the semi-conscious outpourings of the poetic imagination—which is really much allied to lunacy." They are (pp. 15 n., 26) "the meditations of Francis Bacon, for he was a bachelor until 1606," and "the 'Master-Mistress' [of 20] is the personification of the poet's Muse or Genius." In 1922 (*Saturday Review*, CXXXIII, 439, 520) EAGLE added "that the poet is singing of his own *muse*, dressed in the disguise of the beautiful youth," "that Shakespeare himself, and his own art, was the idol of the sonnets." He was scarcely so imaginative as MUDIE (*Self-Named William Sh.*, 1929), who denominates "Sh." as the legitimate Prince of Wales, the son of Elizabeth and Leicester, baptized as "Francis Bacon," and who finds Bacon's name scattered in acrostics through 14, 71, 79, 82, 94, 143, 153, and 154; or as DODD (*Personal Poems of Francis Bacon*, 1931), who informs us that Bacon addressed the sonnets to the queen (appealing "For Recognition as Her Son and Heir"); to his "life-long ideal," Marguerite of Valois; to his wife, Alice Barnham; to Apollo; to James I, the "Rosicrosse," the Masonic Brethren, and so on, incidentally telling of his own literary and philosophical work and of his failure and disgrace as a statesman. In 1937 DODD (*Sh. Creator of Freemasonry*, p. 176) announced that Bacon "did not write the Sonnets for the world of scholars, but to the immediate friends of his bosom, the Brethren [or Freemasons]. . . . The Sonnets, in fact, was the author's last Secret Book to the Craft," which (p. 10) he founded, its name being given in 23.6. A very different opinion is held by WANSCHURA (*Sonette Sh.s.*, 1930, p. 10). He discards 153 and 154 as imitations of a Greek epigram, 129 as a sonnet about lust, and 128 as the only real love-lyric in the collection. Of the remaining one hundred fifty sonnets, eighty-five are dialogs between Bacon and himself, his spirit, or his animal soul. The remaining sixty-five are so-called revelatory poems, in which he clearly bares his personal secrets. The poems of the first group show us the identity of the poet with his friend and with the dark woman, inform us of his human characteristics, discuss his

bachelorhood, his world-weariness, and his confidence of immortality, and allow us to share his joy in his poetic creativeness and his disquietude when he is interrupted. The second group deals with the pseudonymous activity of the poet, his character as a natural son of the queen, and his bitter complaints and reproaches against his ruthless mother.

These revelations seem a bit tame when compared to LATHAM DAVIS's discovery (*Sh. England's Ulysses*, 1905) that the sonnets (written by the second Earl of Essex) form the text of the "masque," *Love's Labor's Won*, mentioned by Meres in 1598. "The time . . . is five years," "the two star performers [are] Mother Nature and Father Time" (p. 23). There are eighteen other characters. I have not puzzled out all Davis's details, but the foregoing are, if not all ye know on earth, at least probably all ye need to know.

PETER ALVOR (*Das Neue Sh.-Evangelium*, 2d ed., 1907, pp. 106-117), to whom "Sh." is an *alias* of the fifth Earl of Rutland, explains that the sonnets are addressed to the poet and his spirit. Thus 1 calls upon "Sh." to put his spirit into words, while 62 shows him discussing himself. Sh.'s "own genius, the spirit of the poet himself, the soul, the imagination, the poet's heart, these are apostrophized." To say that he addressed his poems to a mortal is blasphemy. To BLEIBTREU (*Lösung der Sh.-Frage*, 1907, p. 95), another Rutlander, "the puzzle becomes . . . clear: the beautiful male beloved is the poet's genius, his immortal part, his transcendental Ego, which indeed outlives the corporeal, mortal friend. The capricious and brittle mistress, however, is a muse; that is, a symbol for the same creative power, but differentiated by a nice distinction as *formal* birth from the higher ability to conceive. This all-pervading genius is Shakespeare's 'daimon,' his sole friend and consolation, whereas the fickle muse does not always smile in friendly fashion, but often turns her back and wrinkles her forehead in denial when he begs for her favor. This illustrates the severe struggles of art, before genius really can 'beget perfect children.'"

JACQUES BOULENGER (*L'Affaire Sh.*, 1919, p. 68), a believer in the sixth Earl of Derby as Sh., ridicules the keys, "about seventy, errors excepted," that have supposedly opened the door on Sh.'s secrets, and with admirable self-control announces his intention of refusing, like his guide, ABEL LEFRANC (*Sous le masque de "William Sh.": William Stanley VI^e comte de Derby*, 1918-1919), to provide a seventy-first. Yet who wouldn't have welcomed it? Proponents of Oxford as "Sh." have not often been so forbearing. As a single example (but see pp. 218, 230, below), PERCY ALLEN (*Anne Cecil*, 1934, p. 266) reveals that Oxford wrote the sonnets chiefly "upon his relations, past and present, with [Queen] Elizabeth, and with their son, the actor," Will Hughes. That he wrote so darkly as to hide these facts until 1934 is, no doubt, a compliment to his own skill as well as to his interpreter's.

Here one must call a halt, in spite of the inadequate space allotted to those who consider "Sh." a pseudonym. Undoubtedly eyes not yet created will o'erread the sonnets and find in them revelations and ideas as yet undreamed of. But, meanwhile, perhaps enough tributes to Sh., "Sh.," and "the ruby Shakspeare hewed from his heart's core" have been given to show how wonderful is man of the past and present—and woman too.

APPENDIX VII

THE DEDICATION AND MASTER W. H.

Master W. H., the only begetter of the foregoing sonnets, has caused the spilling of more ink, the utterance of more futile words, than almost any other personage or problem of Q, and there is not the slightest likelihood that the mystery surrounding his initials will ever be dispelled in a fashion satisfactory to a majority of critics, editors, and commentators. It is greatly complicated by the disagreement over the meaning of *onlie begetter*, by the common identification of Mr. W. H. as the fair friend of the sonnets, and by differences of opinion regarding the meaning of the dedication and even its authorship. Discussion of these matters is comparatively recent. For nearly two centuries readers did not have to vex their brains, since Benson in 1640 and all the editions based on him omitted Thorpe's puzzling inscription. No doubt the sonnets would be more often read for their poetry today if Thorpe had discarded his own thirty words.

Long ago WHITE (ed. 1865, p. 152) remarked that "Thorpe appears in his dedication as the Sphinx of literature; and thus far he has not met his Ædipus." A would-be Oedipus, however, lurks in every newspaper, magazine, and book. MACKAIL (*Approach to Sh.*, 1930, pp. 114 f.) speaks of the dedicated words which Thorpe used as "a mere piece of roguish mystification" "so worded as to excite curiosity by a suggestion of some mystery, and promote the sale of the book." If the latter purpose was in Thorpe's mind, it failed grotesquely; if the former, it has been in modern days a sensational success. For practically every word, every letter and point, of the dedication have caused acrimonious disputes. There is no agreement about the meaning of its commonest words and its general purport. Difficulties have piled up, and the stacks of libraries groan under the ever-increasing weight of Sh. scholarship and criticism. An entire library has been written on the four opening words, *To the onlie begetter*.

The earliest editors of Q manifested an abnormal lack of curiosity about the dedication—or perhaps a dignified reticence in the absence of facts. But whereas MALONE passed by it in silence, implying, however (ed. 1780, p. 579), a definition of *begetter* as "inspirer," GEORGE CHALMERS in 1799 (*Supplemental Apology*, p. 52) tackled the problem of Mr. W. H. in modern style: "How he was the *begetter* of them, it is not easy to tell; unless we presume, what is not improbable, that he begot a desire in Shakspeare to deliver a Copy to the Bookseller, for publication: W. H. was the *getter* of the manuscript." Again (p. 91 n.), "*begetter* . . . signified the *obtainer*; as to *get*, and *getter*, in the present day, means *obtain*, and *obtainer*, or to procure, and the procurer." Chalmers's book was widely read, if as widely ridiculed, and it founded the school of interpretation headed a century later by Lee. DRAKE (*Sh. and His Times*, 1817, II, 58 f.) reproduced its statements: "Mr. W. H. had influence enough to *obtain* the manuscript from the poet," and he turned it over to Thorpe, who then wished him all the happiness and eternity "which had been *promised* by the

bard . . . to another, namely, to one of the immediate subjects of his sonnets." Like many a later Southamptonite, he clearly differentiated the friend of Sh.'s lyrics from the man to whom Thorpe dedicated them. SANFORD (*Works of the British Poets*, 1819, III, 31), BOSWELL (ed. 1821, p. 223), and RICHARDSON (*G. M.*, 1835, n. s., IV, 368) followed suit. "The *begetter*," Boswell wrote, "is merely the person who *gets* or *procures* a thing, with the common prefix *be* added to it. . . . W. H. was probably one of the friends to whom Shakspeare's . . . sonnets . . . had been communicated, and who furnished the printer with his copy." Richardson's words are: "The assertion that the person who gave or sold them to the bookseller is the only obtainer of them, is a bookseller's boast, *precisely in the style of a modern fashionable publisher.*" A writer in the *New Monthly Magazine* (1835, XLIII, 6) said: in 1609 "a certain W. H., as I take it, performed the office of collector to those that had been written . . . [in 1599-1609], and carried the whole to Thomas Thorpe, who, in gratitude, dedicated the volume to his nameless benefactor."

But in 1832 BOADEN (*On the Sonnets*, 1837, p. 2) opposed this notion: "That the words 'only begetter' mean the person addressed by the poet, cannot . . . be reasonably questioned—they imply him who, as a *cause*, excited these verses." Two years later, HALLAM (*Introduction*, 1839, III, 289), a man of far greater intellectual powers than any yet mentioned, remarked that by the sonnets' *begetter* "we can only understand the cause of their being written." These pronouncements had a considerable impact. Both KNIGHT (ed. 1841, p. 94) and COLLIER (ed. 1843, p. 474), following arguments used by Drake (1817), hastened to rebut them by saying that Mr. W. H. could not possibly have been the *only* inspirer, because many of the sonnets are addressed to a woman. Both favored the meaning "procurer." Such, too, was the opinion of DELIUS (*Mythus von William Sh.*, 1851, p. 40; *Jahrbuch*, 1865, I, 19, 21) and of HAZLITT (ed. 1852, p. 452 n.), as well as of HUDSON (ed. 1856, p. 117), who added that the procurer or obtainer "was simply the person who made or procured transcripts" of the sonnets. A weightier argument was advanced by an anonymous critic (*Fraser's Magazine*, 1855, LII, 409 f.): "If this dedication had been Shakspeare's, then the 'only begetter' might have meant the cause of the sonnets being *written*; but as it is Thomas Thorpe's, it is much more natural to suppose that in his mouth . . . [it] means the cause of their being published. . . . 'Mr. W. H.' may have been some common friend of Shakspeare and Thorpe, who suggested the publication to both parties. . . . If 'Mr. W. H.' had been a man [or men] of rank and importance . . . we may be sure that 'T. T.' would have given his or their name or names in full, with all their titles and additions." DONNELLY (*Sonnets of Sh.*, 1859, p. 5) explained Thorpe's meaning as, "Mr. W. H. was the sole cause by which the Sonnets were called into existence; that is to say, the sole subject of them." CARTWRIGHT (ed. 1859, p. 3) paraphrased: "Mr. T. T., . . . the publisher, wishes Mr. W. H., the collector of these sonnets, all happiness and that eternity, which the Poet promised his friend." But STAUNTON (ed. 1860, p. 758) dismissed the dedication as "silly in form and very puzzling in expression."

In 1862 a Frenchman, CHASLES (*Athenaeum*, January 25, pp. 116 f.), argued that Thorpe's words are not a "dedication, properly so called, at all, but a kind of monumental inscription," which "has not one continuous sense, but is

broken up into two distinct sentences." The first "contains the real inscription, which is addressed *by* and not *to* W. H." It means, "M[r]. W. H. wisheth to the only begetter of these ensuing Sonnets all happiness and that eternity promised by our ever-living poet." In other words, Mr. W. H., or William Herbert ("the intimacy of Shakespeare and young Herbert is well known"), to whom some of the sonnets are addressed, inscribes the whole group to Southampton, who inspired them. The second sentence means, "The well-wishing adventurer in setting forth (*is*) T. T." In it Thorpe is expressing "his own good wishes . . . for the success of the undertaking in which he (the adventurer) has embarked his capital." Strained as this interpretation was, it immediately gained supporters. An editorial note in the *Athenaeum* (p. 119) applauds Chasles: "Mr. W. H. is not the dedicatee, but the dedicator . . . a point hitherto unsuspected by the wise." Letters from COLLIER and CARTWRIGHT (the same, February 1, p. 155) withholding judgment and raising some objections at once followed. But CORNEY (*N. & Q.*, February 1, March 1, 1862, pp. 87 f., 163 f.) took over the new explanation with burning zeal. He shows the dedication to be a "two-fold inscription" by placing a comma after *Sonnets*, a period after *wisheth*: "To the only begetter of these ensuing Sonnets, Mr. W. H. . . . wisheth. The" and so on. This emendation, he insists, makes Southampton the begetter, or inspirer, Pembroke the composer of the dedication, while "Thorpe did no more than express his wishes for the success of the publication." CORNEY reproduced these views in his *Sonnets of William Sh.*, 1862 (p. 3), which had some temporary vogue. MASSEY (ed. 1866, pp. 418-420; see also the *Athenaeum*, March 16, April 27, 1867, pp. 355 f., 551 f.) at once attacked Chasles and Corney, and showed their reading to be impossible. "The inscription," he insisted, "is essentially one." Thorpe (p. 423) "approached the sonnets on the bookseller's side. He could only dedicate them to the person who obtained them for printing; could only thank the *getter* of them," and he (p. 426) "was proud to call attention to the fact that he was the *only* receiver, the *only* publisher fortunate enough to secure the coveted sonnets." Unshaken by these blasts, CHASLES, who meanwhile had changed his mind about W. H.'s identity, hastened to repeat (*Athenaeum*, February 16, 1867, p. 223): "Thorpe's addition is a mere signature, a flourish, a postscriptum. . . . The great man of the batch is the first one mentioned, *the begetter, the only true creator, the father* of Shakspeare's Sonnets, Southampton. *He* figures at the head of the inscription, crowned with immortality, while T. T. remains humbly crouching at the base, and W. H. kneels in an obscure corner." It is "quite clear" to him (the same, April 13, 1867, p. 487) "1st. That the sole begetter and, in an aesthetical sense, the sole creator of the Sonnets, is Southampton. 2nd. That Southampton is the only person to whom Shakspeare promised immortality. 3rd. That the Sonnets are dedicated by W. H. to Southampton. 4th. That W. H. . . . cannot be a nobleman. 5th. That W. H. cannot be Pembroke. . . . 6th. That . . . Shakspeare may well have allowed a friend or a relation . . . to publish . . . [Q]." Little of this was clear to DYCE (Sh.'s *Works*, 1866, I, 102 n.). As he sensibly remarked, Chasles's idea "that the inscription consists of two distinct sentences, appears to me a groundless fancy; and his notion that . . . 'Mr. W. H.' is the *nominative to the verb* 'wisheth,' offends me as a still wilder dream." MASSEY (ed. 1872, Supplement, p. 31)

quoted Dyce with approval, dismissing the Chasles interpretation as "a frivolous and pedantic notion." It appealed, however, to KARPFF (Τὸ τὴν ἡν εἶπαι, 1869, pp. 42 f.). Without mentioning Chasles's name he reproduced his pointing, explaining that Sh. gave the sonnets for publication to a Mr. W. H., "whose name is of no consequence," and that W. H. in gratitude dedicated them to their sole creator, "the poet's spirit, which is also the poet's beloved." T. T.'s "immaterial" appendage to the dedication shows that "as a partner in the publication he concurs in the good wishes of Mr. W. H."

In 1900 A. HALL (*Literature*, VI, 212) made the rediscovery that the dedication is grammatically ambiguous, and that *W. H.* instead of being in apposition with *begetter*, is the subject of *wisheth*. Hence we should read, "Mr. W. H. wisheth all happiness, and that Eternity promised by our everliving poet, to the only begetter," and so on. Such a reading shows W. H. to be "only endorsing Shakespeare's pledge" to Southampton. Finally, in 1927 (*Anglia*, LI, 31 f.) MARSCHALL revived Chasles's explanation. Apart from this untimely resuscitation, it has suffered death's conquest and made worms its heir.

Both HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS (ed. 1865, p. 369; see *Outlines*, 1882, pp. 150, 289 f.) and WHITE (ed. 1865, p. 149; see also ed. 1883, p. 847) voted for "collector," "procurer." It is true, White admitted, that "'beget' was restricted . . . to . . . the idea of procreation. But this dedication is not written in the common phraseology of its period; it is throughout a piece of affectation and elaborate quaintness, in which the then antiquated prefix 'be' might be expected to occur." PALGRAVE (ed. 1865, p. 240) took no comfort in such opinions: if "inspirer" (Herbert) is rejected, no other explanation sheds any "light whatever upon the poems. It would be useless to know that Mr. W. H. procured them, or that he wished well to their object, author, or procurer: that he was the author himself is of course inadmissible."

NEIL in 1867 (*Athenaeum*, April 27, p. 552) advanced a strange notion that *begetter* may mean "suggestor or suggestress," or "the literal adviser of the production of the book"—in short, Sh.'s wife, "including a pun of that relationship." He was greeted with silence, but, interestingly enough, in 1940 SPENCER (*Art and Life*, p. 32) evolved a not dissimilar meaning: "To beget is to conceive, and obviously Thorpe is not dedicating the book to its author. . . . Quite possibly W. H. was some gentleman, but surely no lord, who conceived the idea of bringing out an unauthorized edition of the much praised lyrics, got Thorpe interested, and agreed to secure a copy of them."

EDMONDS (*Athenaeum*, November 22, 1873, p. 661) gave a totally different explanation: Thorpe, "feeling deeply indebted to 'Mr. W. H.' for having obtained for him the privilege of publishing . . . [Q], wishes him all happiness, and that eternity promised by the great bard to those who are instrumental in preserving things which the world 'would not willingly let die.' And this thought was probably suggested by the first lines in 'Love's Labour's Lost.'"

At a meeting of the New Sh. Society (*N. Sh. S. T.*, 1875-1876, pp. xviii f.) BRAE and INGLEBY proposed a new Chasles-like punctuation and meaning: "[To . . . Mr. W. H.] 'All happinesse <on earth> & that Eternitie promised' <in heaven>. 'By <for or to> our everliving Poet <=W. Shakspeare> Wisheth the well-wishing Adventurer <Thomas Thorpe>'" and so forth. But "this reading was unhesitatingly rejected" by the president and others,

Shortly afterwards LICHTENBERGER (*De carminibus Shakesperi cum nova Thorpianæ inscriptionis interpretatione*, 1877, pp. 40-46) conjectured that Thorpe used *begetter* especially with reference to the opening group of procreation sonnets, and that the eternity of fame promised to W. H. signified not only an illustrious name but also an eternal line of progeny. Thorpe desires what the poet himself has desired: that a son may be begotten by the young man who hitherto by his beauty has begotten only sonnets upon the genius of the poet. Perhaps by 1609 the friend was married. Thus the dedication would have a double meaning, one public and one private. HENRY (*Sonnets de Sh.*, 1900, pp. ix-xi) and FILON (*Revue des deux mondes*, 1901, 5th series, II, 800) looked with some favor on this "new interpretation," though the former finally announced his decision that *begetter* must mean the actual procreator or father of the sonnets.¹ Almost nothing since has been heard of it, except from FORT (*Library*, December, 1928, p. 317), who paraphrases: Thorpe wishes to Mr. W. H. "all happiness . . . and that eternity which is promised in the last two lines of the sixteenth and seventeenth sonnets to any one who begets a son."

DOWDEN's view (ed. 1881, p. 21) was: "There is special point in the choice of the word 'begetter,' if the dedication be addressed to the person who inspired the poems and for whom they were written. Eternity through offspring is what Shakspeare most desires for his friend. If he will not beget a child, then he is promised eternity in verse by his poet." SHARP (ed. 1885, p. 24), taking a hint from MINTO (*Characteristics*, 1874, p. 284 n.), glossed *onlie begetter* as "'the sole bringer forth, the sole cause of,' or else 'the incomparable inspirer'"; while STRAFFORELLO (*Curiosità ed amenità*, 1889, p. 165) translated it as "il solo procreatore" and OLIVIERI (Sh.'s *Sonetti*, 1890, p. 1) as "al solo originatore." VERITY (ed. 1890, p. 401), asserting—wrongly—that "the majority of writers agree . . . [on] 'inspirer,'" explains away the bothersome *onlie* on the ground that it "might fairly be said of the person to whom a hundred and twenty-six of the sonnets are directly addressed, and with whom the remaining poems are more or less concerned." But meanwhile the *N. E. D.* (1888) had dealt a blow at the "procurer" group. For *beget*, meaning "get" or "acquire," it lists only seven examples, the sixth dating from 1393, the last being a sentence from *Hamlet*, III.ii.8, "You must acquire and beget a temperance." For *begetter*, figuratively meaning "the agent that originates, produces, or occasions," it cites Thorpe's disputed phrase and three other examples of the dates 1587, 1637, and 1884, but all give cold comfort to those who favor a procurer for Q.

The *N. E. D.* was far from settling the dispute. FLEAY (*Biographical Chronicle*, 1891, II, 211) made an original contribution: *begetter* means "the dedicatee at whose expense they were produced to the public, and possibly the original suggester of their being written." VON MAUNTZ (Sh.'s *Gedichte*, 1894,

¹ HENRY (p. vii) translated the phrase, "Au véritable père de ces sonnets." HUGO's words (Sh.'s *Sonnets*, 1857, p. 49) are, "Au seul détenteur de ces sonnets" and (Sh.'s *Œuvres*, 1865, XV, 38), "A l'unique acquéreur de ces sonnets." BURGERSDIJK (Sh.'s *Sonnetten*, 1879, p. 168) translates "den eenigen verwekker."

pp. 149-152) next disclosed that the dedication looks like a tombstone inscription, in which the publisher addressed allegorically Mr. W. H. as if he were quoting the last two lines of 107. W. H. himself was an unknown admirer of Sh.'s, not a nobleman, for Thorpe would have been only too glad to recommend his book with a noble name in full. Sh., who apparently had small esteem for the sonnets, may have given or sold them to W. H. A different foreign paraphrase, that of SANFELICE (*Rivista d'Italia*, 1898, III, 315), runs thus: "I, the editor, have been able to procure the sonnets of Shakespeare, thanks to the word and authority of W. H., who alone could have achieved so much, and I, grateful to him for having induced Shakespeare to let them finally be published, wish to him, W. H., also that happiness and eternity which the poet in these sonnets wishes for his friend and inspirer. This I wish for him because of his great merit in having kept from dispersal the sonnets of the great poet, who has been up to now reluctant to release them for publication." Sanfelice further explains that W. H. is William Herbert, Southampton the friend and inspirer.

A somewhat profitless discussion was enlivened by the various publications of LEE. He clears the ground (*Life*, 1898, p. 391) by showing that "in ordinary grammatical order" the dedication would run: "The well-wishing adventurer in setting forth (*i. e.* the publisher) T(homas) T(horpe) wisheth Mr. W. H., the only begetter of these ensuing sonnets, all happiness and that eternity promised by our ever-living poet." Thorpe, he says (p. 92), wished for W. H. "such eternity as Shakespeare in the text of the sonnets conventionally foretold for his own verse," and his words indicate that W. H. "was the first of the pirate-publisher fraternity to procure a manuscript of Shakespeare's sonnets and recommend its surreptitious issue." The pirate in question (see pp. 216-219, below) he definitely named as William Hall. The battle now began to wax furious. CUMING WALTERS (*Mystery of Sh.'s Sonnets*, 1899, p. 109), to be sure, followed Lee. But the latter was bitterly assailed by BUTLER, who (ed. 1899, pp. 25-30) denied that any modern example of *begetter* with the meaning "procurer" could be found. To him *onlie begetter* suggested so inescapably the "only begotten" of the Nicene Creed that he could not "imagine any one's using the words 'only begetter' without intending the verb 'beget' to mean metaphorically what it means in 'only begotten.'" Perhaps Butler's discussion gives too little attention to the chance that Thorpe may have distorted the language and assigned an individual, if incorrect, significance to the phrase. Better and worse men do exactly that every day. In reply to him and other critics LEE in two articles (*Athenaeum*, February 24, March 17, 1900, pp. 250 f., 345 f.) gave a long string of examples—he admits (p. 250 n.) that Thorpe's phrase is "a capricious reminiscence" of the Bible—to support his definition, only to have DOWDEN (the same, March 10, p. 315) successfully challenge the validity of them all.

To the support of Dowden came BEECHING (ed. 1904, pp. xxxiv f.). *Onlie begetter*, he asserted, is "a phrase which ninety-nine persons out of every hundred, even of those familiar with Elizabethan literature, would unhesitatingly understand to mean . . . inspirer." Further, "'only-begotten' is so familiar an English phrase that 'only' could hardly be used with 'beget' if the verb had an unusual sense." Even if it were, what could "only" mean if the "begetter"

is the "procurer"? "Allowing it to be conceivable that a piratical publisher should inscribe a book of sonnets to the thief who brought him the manuscript, why should he lay stress on the fact that 'alone he did it'? Was it an enterprise of such great peril?" LUCE (*Handbook*, 1906, p. 90), rushing into the fray, suggested that if *begetter* can signify "obtainer," "then 'only' may mean 'only true and genuine,' 'never before procured,' 'only thus made available for publication.'" He also inquired whether *begetter* includes the final poem in Q, the *L. C.*—but failed to ask whether the *L. C.* is likewise included in the phrase *these insuing sonnets*. Much earlier, however, *insuing* had been explained, as by WILLIAM ARCHER (*Fortnightly*, 1897, LXVIII, 831), to mean "next ensuing," with the result that it refers only to 1-126, not to the dark-woman sonnets.

Not in the least dismayed by his numerous opponents LEE returned to the attack (ed. 1905, pp. 37 f.): "Thorpe acknowledges the services of 'Mr. W. H.' in 'procuring' and collecting in his behalf the 'private' transcripts, from which the volume was printed. To 'Mr. W. H.'s' sole exertions the birth of the publication may be attributed. . . . In Elizabethan English there was no irregularity in the use of 'begetter' in its primary sense of 'getter' or 'procurer,' without any implication of that common secondary meaning of 'breed' or 'generate,' which in modern speech has altogether displaced the earlier signification." He added (pp. 39 f.) another argument, which turns up also in his later works. I quote from the *Life*, 1915 (pp. 684 f.): "In 1600, one John Bodenham in similar circumstances made over to . . . Hugh Astley an anthology of . . . quotations, which Astley issued under the title of 'Belvedere or The Garden of the Muses.' In a prefatory page Bodenham was called 'First causer and collectour of these Flowers,' and at the end of the book 'The Gentleman who was the cause of this collection.' Thorpe applied to 'Mr. W. H.' the word 'begetter' in the same sense as Astley applied the words 'first causer' and 'the cause' to John Bodenham, the procurer of the copy for . . . 'Belvedere.'" It seems not to have been observed that Lee's parallel case refutes his argument; for Bodenham is called the originator and inspirer of *Belvedere*, and he is so called, not by the publisher Astley, but by the editor of the volume, A. M. (probably Anthony Munday).

To Lee's rejoinders and additional arguments BEECHING (in Bullen, ed. 1907, p. 367 n.) retorted: Sh. "promised 'eternity' not to the thief who purloined his poems, but to the friend to whom they were addressed. There is just the possibility that Thorpe intended to say that as long as Shakespeare's sonnets were read, so long would the thief's good offices be held in grateful remembrance by an obliged world. But . . . if he had meant that, would he not have said so?" SCHÜCKING (*Frankfurter Zeitung*, March 26, 1907, erstes Morgenblatt, p. 2) took Lee to task for not realizing that, so far as content is concerned, the dedication and the sonnets are independent of each other. He interpreted *that eternitie promised by our ever-living poet* as "that eternity which our ever-living poet gives promise of achieving." W. H.'s (or Hall's) fame is eternal because his name is joined forever to the work of an immortal poet. ROEDDER (*Sh.'s Sonette*, 1913, p. 7) presented the new guess that 38.5 f., 78.9 f., and 100.7 f. caused Thorpe to dedicate the book to Sh.'s friend. That the latter was Mr. W. H. is indicated by the parallel between the dedication to him and the dedica-

tion of *Lucrece* to Southampton, "VVhat I haue done is yours, what I haue to doe is yours" being in plain English, "You are the begetter [inspirer] of what I have done and have to do."

In 1915 MORSBACH (*Göttingen Nachrichten*, pp. 150-158), more or less in repetition of Dowden, took up Lee's examples in an effort to prove that *begetter* never had the meaning "procurer"—not even in the *Hamlet* passage cited by the *N. E. D.* But his proof was unavailing, for in the next year KELLER (*Sh.s Werke*, 1916, XV, 509) called up *Hamlet* as a witness for "procurer." Years later KELLER (*Englische Literatur*, 1928, p. 70) reiterated this belief, which was shared by BRAY (ed. 1925, p. xiii), ARTHUR GRAY (*Chapter*, 1926, pp. 98 f.), MACKAIL (*Approach to Sh.*, 1930, p. 114), and FRIPP (*Shakespeare*, 1938, II, 715). But meanwhile POOLER (ed. 1918) had made an illuminating comment: *To the onlie begetter* "means, 'to the begetter of these Sonnets only.' In other words, Thorpe jesting . . . says—since you are the parent of nothing but sonnets, and cannot therefore immortalise yourself in your posterity as the poet urged you to do, I wish you the alternative immortality he promised, that his writings will preserve your memory forever."

The anti-Stratfordians run true to the orthodox molds, and explain the dedication as whim dictates. Perhaps three examples will suffice. LEGIS (*N. & Q.*, November 25, 1876, p. 421) apparently interprets *begetter* as "that 'spirit of human knowledge' which is the begetter of all true works"; and RANDALL DAVIES, another Baconian (*Notes*, 1927, pp. 8 f.), "not being a Professor," rejects the usual explanation to substitute his own paraphrase: "Mr. W. H. (wisheth) all happiness; and T. T. the well-wishing adventurer in setting forth wisheth that eternity promised by our ever-living poet, to the only begetter of these ensuing Sonnets (i. e. The Earl of Southampton)." W. H., he says, is William Hall, Thorpe's "jackal." But W. D. O'CONNOR (*Hamlet's Note-Book*, 1886, p. 52) equates *onlie begetter* with the "sole author," or Raleigh.

From the dead-end street of the *onlie begetter* various bypaths have been constructed for the use of anyone who desires.¹ GODWIN (ed. 1900, p. 12) rejects both "procurer" and "inspirer." Thorpe, he says, had read the sonnets carefully, "and desiring . . . to be quaint and funny," he gave their author's initials (see p. 215, below) as W. H., thereby hoping to avert "the wrath of the poet, whose wares he had surreptitiously acquired." On the contrary, MAIN (*Treasury*, 1880, p. 279) had assured us, "Thorpe's expression implies *both* senses—procurer *and* originator—and was no doubt chosen for that reason." LANDAUER (*Shakespeare*, 1920, II, 320 f.), probably unaware that he had been anticipated, also decided that Thorpe in the one word *begetter* wished to express both meanings "in a confused union of words: 'Thou art the man, to whom these sonnets are addressed, to whom the poet has promised immortality, which will not be lacking to himself, and I thank thee for the possibility of publishing them; I, modest man, desire to wish thee what the poet has promised thee.'" But if he lacked originality here he achieved it by saying of the concluding words of the dedication: "I believe . . . that T. T. in his affected language,² in which the fashionable tone and petty bourgeois clumsiness meet,

¹ For EDUARD SIEVERS's view that Mr. W. H. was part-author of Q see pp. 48 f., below.

² [BUTLER (ed. 1899, p. 30) sees not "a single word used in an uncommon

wished to express by means of this figure drawn from sailor's language his feeling that he, as the publisher, was undertaking a risk." Those who love compromise will endorse FORT's assurance (*Library*, December, 1928, p. 317) that *begetter* can mean "'procreator, causer, author, inspirer,' obtainer, and . . . 'bringer-to-life.'"¹

Nearly every other phrase in the dedication has aroused similar debate. *Our ever-living poet* is often explained as Thorpe's graceful compliment to Sh. as a sonneteer; sometimes—for example, by W. C. HAZLITT (*Shakespeare*, 1902, p. 190)—as an allusion to the fame Sh. had won by his plays. LOONEY ("*Sh.*" *Identified*, 1920, p. 419), on the contrary, is certain that it could have referred only to a dead author, and many of his Oxfordian disciples, like B. R. WARD (*Mystery of "Mr. W. H."*, 1923, pp. 19, 94-98), assent. Ward, indeed, gives twenty-three uses of *ever-living*, none of which, he insists, refers to a living person; he might have included as a later example MAURICE BOUCHOR's French sonnet (*Chansons joyeuses*, 1874, pp. 81 f.) with the English title "To Our Ever Living Poet William Shakespeare." *Ever-living*, however (see *N. E. D.*, 1891), means "immortal," and hence can apply either to the quick or the dead. But to BRANDL (*Shakespeare*, 1922, 1937, p. 153) the phrase, the dedication in general, and the name on the title-page conclusively indicate that Sh. was no longer eager to keep the sonnets from the press. The publication of Q was not displeasing to him because in the meantime—in 1607—Southampton's mother had died. For her eyes he had written the lyrics praising her son's beauty.

The well-wishing adventurer in setting forth, oddly enough, has not always been equated with its appositional initials T. T. LEE (ed. 1905, p. 37) quotes two analogous expressions, *well-willer* and *setter out*, from Elizabethan books. FLEAY, however, in 1886 (see p. 220, below) described Thorpe's phrase as applying, not to himself, but to W. H. (or Harvey); and MATHEW (*Image of Sh.*, 1922, p. 111), while referring *adventurer* to Thorpe, sees a reference also to Southampton, "one of the chief patrons of the Merchant Adventurers to America." Mathew's view is apparently that of BALDENSPERGER, who informs me that he is "more and more convinced of the spurious, even black-mailing, character" of the dedication. More plausible are the words of POOLER (ed. 1918): "An allusion to the Merchant Venturers, the ensuing sonnets being Thorpe's cargo." Thorpe has even been deprived of his initials. Thus HOSMER (*Bacon and Sh. in the Sonnets*, 1887, p. 145) identifies T. T. as "The Truth." WILHELM WERCKMEISTER (*Zukunft*, 1896, XIV, 454-461), using alleged mathematical devices based on the "strange" shape of the type in T. T., discovers a message of considerable directness: "Neither William Herbert, Earl of elder line, nor Thomas Thorpe, but I laboriously contrived the following. Francis Bacon."² T. T. "might possibly have been the signa-

sense, or a single sign of extravagance" in the dedication. So MORSBACH (Göttingen *Nachrichten*, 1915, p. 165) praises its grave, suitable tone, its total lack of peculiarities in language and style.]

¹ DIEGO ANGELI (*Vita di Guglielmo Sh.*, 1934, p. 212) translates, "All' amico procuratore (o ispiratore). . . ."

² REICHEL (*Sh.-Litteratur*, 1887, pp. 464 f. n.), without mathematics, had reached the same conclusion.

ture of the dark woman," FINCH BARNARD (*Science and the Soul*, 1918, p. 12) hazards, thereby widening the field for research students, and the adventurer is Mr. W. H. To LOONEY ("Sh." *Identified*, 1920, p. 441) the initials are those of Thomas Trentham, Lord Oxford's father-in-law, to whom the widowed Countess of Oxford (in 1604) "would naturally turn for assistance in straightening out the affairs"; but to DODD (*Sh. Creator of Free-masonry*, 1937, pp. 178 f.) T. T. "simply stands for 'Thirty-Three,' the highest Degree in Masonry."

One might expect members of eccentric literary cults, Baconian and the rest, to challenge T. T.'s authorship of the dedication. Orthodox Shakespeareans have not infrequently indulged in the same sport. CHASLES's statement that Pembroke or W. H. was its author has already been mentioned (pp. 167-169, above). TYLER (*Academy*, 1890, XXXVII, 409) believed it probable that Sh. suggested to Thorpe "the matter and form of the dedication"; and in 1898 (see p. 220, below) STOPES conjectured that Mr. W. H. (or Hervey) composed the inscription to honor his stepson Southampton. CROSLAND (*English Sonnet*, 1917, pp. 198-204) in all seriousness urged that the dedication was written by Sh.: its author was "not only an artist, but the best artist in dedication of his time." Sh. is "written in every stroke." He signed his work T. T. because, although "a poet may boast himself in his verse, . . . he must not boast himself in prose." The sonnets were "written out of a desire on the part of the author to make it evident to the world that he was something more than a successful playwright, and that he could compete with the best non-dramatic poets before him and the best poets of his period on their own ground, and even outstrip them." Hence he penned the dedication to arouse interest, curiosity, speculation. It "would certainly have read better without 'Mr. W. H.'; on the other hand, by the omission it would have lost in its power to arouse curiosity. 'Mr. W. H.' . . . was a figment, set up to provoke talk, and though it failed of its immediate purpose, inasmuch as the sonnets were not successful from a bookselling point of view, it was destined to do subsequent service for its shrewd originator, of which he may, or may not, have had a proper degree of prevision." Eclipsing even Stopes and Crosland,¹ FORBIS (*Shakespearean Enigma*, 1924, p. 194) disclosed "that 'Mr. W. H.,' and not 'T. T.' is the one who wishes happiness and eternity to the adventurer in setting forth. This indicates, quite conclusively, that Mr. W. H. wrote the dedication, and that the adventurer was T. T." After such word-twisting it is somewhat of a surprize to learn that T. T. remains Thorpe.

Much of the controversy about the significance of the dedication has arisen from the assumption, conscious or unconscious, that Sh. is responsible for *the onlie begetter*. Thus HOTSON (*I, William Sh.*, 1937, p. 12), observing that "Mr. W. H. is not mentioned in Shakespeare's will," inquires: "What had happened to the only begetter? Had the friendship [or Mr. W. H.] died?" As MASSEY (ed. 1866, pp. 417 f.) said long ago, if Sh. himself had written the dedication, *begetter* could mean only "inspirer." S. L. WOLFF's comment in his thesis, *The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction*, 1912 (p. viii),

¹ Compare J. M. FEELY (*Cypher in the Sonnets*, 1940, p. 3): "The dedication . . . was an original part of the work of the composer of The Sonnets themselves; or if it was superadded in 1609, it was not done by another hand."

"Professor Woodberry was 'the onlie begetter' of the studies . . . in this book," has, I imagine, misled nobody. Professors in Columbia University or elsewhere are not given to "procuring," "obtaining," or "filching" theses for their students. But, to quote MASSEY (p. 418) again, "the Inscription is *not* Shakspeare's; the 'only begetter' and the 'Mr. W. H.' are not *his*; they are only Thomas Thorpe's." No evidence, only speculation, has ever been produced to prove that Thorpe knew the identity of the friend of the sonnets, or that Thorpe was associated in any way with Sh., and hence Lee's general position seems to me sounder than that of his assailants: in short, Mr. W. H. (Lee's William Hall is nothing but guess-work) was, in one way or another, the "getter" of the manuscript published by Thorpe; and if Sh. had been concerned in the publication, W. H.'s initials would have had no place in any dedication penned by him. LEE (ed. 1905, p. 36) is, in my opinion, correct in asserting that the dedication of Q "has no bearing on Shakespeare's intentions as sonneteer, but exclusively concerns Thorpe's action and position as the publisher." Thousands, to be sure, have thought, and thousands will think, him incorrect. These latter will not agree with GEORGE SAMPSON (*Concise Cambridge History*, 1941, p. 271) that even if Mr. W. H.'s identity were known, it "could tell us nothing vitally important about our supreme poet and dramatist; and so the sensible course is to dismiss that embarrassing phantom and his delusive dedication from our minds, and to think of the sonnets as poems, and not as puzzles."

APPENDIX VIII

THE FRIEND AND MASTER W. H.

MALONE and STEEVENS (ed. 1780) believed that Sh.'s sonnet sequence fell neatly into two parts: 1-126, written to a man friend; 127-154, directed to a dark woman. As the section on Arrangement (pp. 74-116, above) shows, that belief has been widely held up to the present day—and just as widely rejected. BOADEN (*On the Sonnets*, 1837, p. 21) was unduly optimistic in declaring that DRAKE (*Sh. and His Times*, 1817) "has shown the absolute certainty that 126 of the Sonnets . . . were addressed to a *male* friend and patron of Shakespeare." If the past be a guide, there is no possibility of future agreement about what sonnets deal with a man, W. H. or another, and, indeed, many intelligent persons (see pp. 243 f., 246 f., below) have been almost ready to go to the stake for their conviction that all the sonnets concern some woman or women.

Many other writers have detected the presence of more than one man friend. RICHARDSON (*G. M.*, 1835, n. s., IV, 369) even vouches for "several different individuals, male and female," and NEIL (*Shakespeare*, 1861, p. 108) for "noble and beloved friends" plus the author's son Hamnet and three women. Less erratic and more generally accepted is the opinion of ZIMMERMANN (*Studien*, 1870, II, 121) that the young friend of the first section is not necessarily he who won the favors of the dark woman. Zimmermann generalizes loosely. VON MAUNTZ (Sh.'s *Gedichte*, 1894, p. 300) particularizes: the man of 41, 42, 144 cannot be the patron (Southampton) of 70 and 78. Just so SARRAZIN (*William Sh.'s Lehrjahre*, 1897, p. 169) remarks that one or more men may have been the subject of the "later sonnets." "It is not clear from the text," LEE (ed. 1905, p. 8 n.) writes, "whether all the sonnets addressed to a man are inscribed to the same person," or even if all 1-126 have a male object. NEILSON and THORNDIKE (*Facts*, 1913, p. 48) consider "the identification of the young man of the first seventeen sonnets with other friends who are praised in later sonnets . . . not certain, though in some cases probable." In REDIN's opinion (*E. S.*, 1922, LVI, 390-407), the ten "dedicatory sonnets" (78-80, 82-86, and possibly 26 and 38), 1-17, and perhaps others may well be directed to one man, a noble patron (in this case Southampton), whom Sh. addresses with "reverent affection" and with no accusation of immorality. Many others (such as 40-42, 69, 70, 94-96, 133, 134, 144) contain "expressions of passion or accusation" or both; these "can scarcely have been written" to a noble patron, and force the conviction "that there are at least two male addressees." A few sonnets, NOYES, 1924 (*New Essays*, 1927, pp. 114 f.), concludes, may perhaps be "directly addressed to a particular friend; others may have been given to other friends"; and a number stand alone, detached from any "series." Even if the order of Q be canonical, KITTREDGE (ed. 1936, p. 1491) decides, it does not follow that only one person is addressed in 1-126. A few (25, 26, 38) "might have been sent to a noble and friendly patron"; 30-32 "might be ad-

dressed to the same patron or to some friend of more nearly the poet's own rank"; but 20, 21, 48, 56, 66, 69, 73-75, 118, 119, 126 "cannot reasonably be supposed to have been offered to a great nobleman."

Such decisions are, I think, made necessary by a close reading of the sonnets. The man of 40-42 and 144, for example, is a young fornicator who has stolen his friend's mistress; always "temptation followes" (41.4) where he is. Again in 95 and 96 his "sinnes" and "vices," the shame that spots his name, his lechery are harped upon. But in 70, still young and beautiful, he is virtuous. Only his beauty has invited slanderous gossip, "For slanders marke was euer yet the faire" (line 2). It is undeserved; in his "pure vnstayined prime" he has always circumvented or conquered the temptations of youth, has "past by the ambush of young daies" (lines 8 f.). Once again, in 79, his chastity is emphasized. The rival poet has eulogized his virtue, but (lines 9 f.) "he stole that word [*virtue*], From thy behauiour." It seems inevitable that readers who interpret the sonnets and their story literally must admit that more than one man is featured in them. Noticeably, too, the "louely Boy" of 126 has all the youthful attractiveness of the boy of 1-19, whereas 77, if interpreted literally, tells that his beauties are wearing, that his mirror reflects wrinkles (see I, 198) impressive enough to remind him (line 6) "Of mouthed graues."

The comments of von Mauntz, Sarrazin, Neilson and Thorndike, Noyes, Kittredge, and countless others—of autobiographical as well as anti-autobiographical interpreters—have played havoc with Sh.'s real or alleged friend—have pluralized him out of all knowing. It is not unusual to come across books and articles in which, with god-like divination, a dozen or more male friends are assigned to particular lyrics. As a single illustration, CONWAY (*Supernatural in Sh.*, 1932, pp. 28-30, 32 f.) asserts that Sh.'s sonnets about his profession (presumably 110 and 111) likely were written "to Burbage or Ben Jonson or some other actor friend"; 1-13 to Pembroke; 26, 27, 97-126 and probably 79-81 to Southampton; 82-87 probably to Oxford; while Fulke Greville "may have been addressed in Sonnets 68-83. And Edmund Spenser, Gabriel Harvey, and many others may have been the recipients of the individual sonnets," and "55-60 may have been . . . addressed to Lord Essex." *May* and *probably* do strange service to scholarship. Conway's baseless assumptions have unfortunately been duplicated and reduplicated elsewhere until the friend has degenerated into an ameba. There is really no use in discussing him (or them), since almost nobody is ever convinced by another's arguments or assertions. If the friend actually did die single (the idea is hotly disputed), his image lives on preposterously remembered in a hundred men, women, and abstractions. No doubt Sh. had this eventuality in mind when he predicted, "Thou single wilt proue none," and inquired, "Whereof are you made, That millions of strange shaddowes on you tend?"

But to return to our muttons. If the inability of the friend to retain one masculine shape has wrought havoc with scholarship and theorizing, even more havoc is added by his supposed connection with the dedication. Commonly it has been taken for granted that for the presence of Mr. W. H. Sh. is responsible, and, indeed, that Mr. W. H. is identical with the sweet boy of the sonnets. Possibly such is the case (many better men than I have thought so); but it can do no harm to repeat that, on the evidence of Q itself (the only real evi-

dence available), Mr. W. H. was the friend, actual or feigned, of the printer Thorpe; that Sh., who did not write the dedication, had no responsibility whatever for his being named in the volume.

MALONE thought otherwise. Most other early commentators, regarding Mr. W. H. as Thorpe's "procurer," paid him little attention. The inventor of the Southampton theory, DRAKE (see p. 186, below), would have been shocked to think that his hero was saluted by Thorpe as a plain "Mr." When KNIGHT (ed. 1841) discussed the problem, it had not been darkened by the ink of ten thousand pens and presses. Hence he could say (pp. 94 f.) with GEORGE CHALMERS (1799) that Mr. W. H. was "an humble person," not the friend of the sonnets; that "he was either William Harte, the poet's nephew, or William Hews, some unknown individual," whereas the friend "was one of rank"; and that, whatever his name, Mr. W. H. "put these poems in the hands" of the printer.

Yet shortly afterward, GERVINUS (*Sh. Commentaries* [1849], 1863, I, 622) asserted that Thorpe "plainly designates that 'begetter,' as the very man to whom Shakespeare in the sonnets promised immortality through his verse. . . . That . . . the man, to whom the sonnets . . . are dedicated, is the man to whom they were addressed, is quite indubitable." BELL (ed. 1855, pp. 148-151), objecting to all the friends proposed to date, remarked, "W. H., whoever he may have been, must . . . be regarded as the 'dear friend' of the Sonnets." Such was also the belief of KENNY (*Life and Genius*, 1864, p. 80 n.), but he insisted that W. H. "was simply a gentleman, and not a nobleman"—a matter upon which scores of painful warriors famed for fight (and some for worth) have waged an indecisive battle of words.

To skip half a century of discussion. BEECHING (ed. 1904, p. xxxvi), arguing against Lee's "procurer," says: "The whole tone of the dedication, which is respectful, and the unusual absence of a qualifying phrase, such as 'his esteemed friend,' before the initials, are against the theory that Mr. W. H. was on the same social level as the publisher." In strong contrast WALSH (ed. 1908, p. 19), while not objecting to W. H. as the friend, declares that "'Mr.' was in those days itself the designation of a particular rank, extending even beneath that of 'Gent.,' or gentleman, by including master-craftsmen: it was itself a title, coveted by inferior orders, but despised by those above." "'Mr. W. H.,'" he decides, "could not possibly be a nobleman." According to JUSSELAND (*Literary History*, 1909, III, 232), "Mr. W. H. was . . . the subject at once of the dedication and of the sonnets. . . . The probabilities are that . . . [he] was neither a lord nor a personage of note: hence the difficulty of an identification." H. D. GRAY's notion (*P. M. L. A.*, 1915, XXX, 631) is different: Thorpe himself knew that many of the sonnets "were addressed to a young man who in 1609 was a person of some importance; Thorpe knew his name . . . and took it upon himself to dedicate his book of . . . Sonnets to their 'only begetter' (using, of course, and wisely, merely the initials)." CHAMBERS (*William Sh.*, 1930, I, 566) cannot "believe that, even in Thorpe's affected phrasing, the person to whom he wished eternity was any other than the person to whom the 'ever-living poet' promised eternity."

It is more difficult still, in my judgment, to believe that Thorpe could have known who the friend of the sonnets was, or even that he thought he knew or

pretended to know. Plausibility seems to me on the side of CARPENTER (*Catholic World*, 1918, CVI, 507), who writes that the sonnets "were not dedicated by Shakespeare to anybody, noble lord or commoner, or anybody else: . . . they were never dedicated to any noble lord by anybody; . . . a man named Thorpe dedicated them to one of his own personal friends"; and of JOHN BAILEY (*Shakespeare*, 1929, p. 59), who considers that W. H. was "foisted into the Sonnets on the shoulders of the pirate publisher, and possibly or probably had nothing to do with Shakespeare at all." Such scholars as MORSBACH (*Göttingen Nachrichten*, 1915, pp. 160, 163) and RITTER (*Der unbekannte Sh.*, 1922, p. 262), who refuse to identify Mr. W. H. with the friend because the latter was, as the former was not, a nobleman, merely confuse the issue, and beg the question.

The foregoing are but a tiny specimen of scholarly opinion. Probably those who consider Mr. W. H. and the friend one person are the more numerous, and their number accounts for the almost frantic, world-wide searching for a man, beloved by Sh., whose names have these initials. Even if the dedication had never been composed, sooner or later Henry Wriothesley, third Earl of Southampton, and William Herbert, third Earl of Pembroke, would have been thought of, but few of the other "friends" would. Sh. and Thorpe, MINTO (*Characteristics*, 1874, p. 283) remarked, "have immortalised everybody in that generation whose initials are known to have been W and H, read either way." That Sh. had anything to do with conferring this immortality is, I repeat, doubtful in the extreme; but the fact remains that the initials are responsible for most of the identifications proposed not only for the dedicatee, considered separately, but for the friend of the sonnets as well.

In general, writers discuss the friend in accordance with their preconceived notions of the meaning and significance of the dedication. Those who accept Mr. W. H. as the dear love of the sonnets, interpreting *begetter* as "inspirer," try to find a man (usually young, sometimes an earl, again a knight, a naval cook, a tapster, or Sh. himself) with the appropriate (or misprinted) initials; those who refuse to equate Mr. W. H. with the friend, ordinarily explaining *begetter* as "procurer" or "getter," sometimes try, sometimes do not try, to identify the initials, but consider them of small importance in determining the friend's name. Still others hold the theory that the sonnets are allegorical or dramatic or mere literary exercises, and in presenting it they may or may not attempt to name the friend. Another multitude, usually with great attention to the preface, argue for non-Shakespearean authorship of the sonnets and for a friend who often is, just as often is not, Mr. W. H., the man of a hundred names. Hence it is impossible adequately to summarize opinion about Mr. W. H. or to indicate precisely his role in all the identifications that have been made of the friend—or friends. The best that can be done is to take up chronologically the theories about who the friend and Mr. W. H. (separately or together) were.

WILLIAM HUGHES (HEWES)

In the eighteenth century two distinguished scholars, THOMAS TYRWHITT (died 1786) and RICHARD FARMER (died 1797), started the guessing contest about the friend, or Mr. W. H. According to MALONE (ed. 1780, p. 579), "Dr. Farmer supposes that many of these Sonnets are addressed to our au-

thor's nephew Mr. William Harte. But this, I think, may be doubted," for Joan Hart was born in April, 1569, and her son could not have been older than twelve in 1598. Others, like DRAKE (*Sh. and His Times*, 1817, II, 60), quickly noted that Hart was baptized on August 28, 1600, whereupon the boy-nephew was definitely removed from consideration.

The second eighteenth-century candidate has turned out to be longer-lived. When MALONE (ed. 1780, p. 579) wrote, "Mr. Tyrwhitt has pointed out to me a line . . . [20.7: 'A man in hew all *Hews* in his controwling'] which inclines me to think that the initials W. H. stand for W. Hughes," he created a spook harder to drive away than the ghost of Hamlet's father. "To this person, whoever he was, one hundred and twenty [changed to 'one hundred and twenty six' in ed. 1790 (p. 191)] of the following poems are addressed," Malone added, and accordingly he, more than any other person, must receive the credit, or discredit, for equating the friend of the sonnets with the dedicatee of Thorpe. His friend and editor BOSWELL (ed. 1821, p. 218) saw no merit in Malone's decision, and he pointed out that the italics in "*Hews*" are unimportant, because "several other words, where no quibble could have been intended, such as *intrin*, . . . *alien*, *audit*, *quietus*, *hereticke*, are printed in the same manner." Many other scholars have enforced this argument (see also pp. 7 f., 16, above). For example, DOWDEN (ed. 1881, p. 207), enumerating the capitalized and italicized words in 1, 4, 55, 56, 78, 100, 104, 112, 114, 119, 124-126, justly enough finds the instance in 20 of no importance. BEECHING (ed. 1904, p. xlii) observes that "*every* word printed in italics" in Q has a capital letter, "so that a capital letter to a [seventeenth-century] reader of the Quarto would not be in the least suggestive of a proper name as it is to us. Moreover, the line contains no pun, such as we have upon the name 'Will' " in 135 and 136. MACKAIL (*Lectures*, 1911, pp. 194 f.) is more emphatic still: "*Hews* only occurs once in the Sonnets: the singular, *hew*, indeed occurs five times, but without the least suggestion either by context or typography of a double meaning. But *Rose* occurs no less than ten times, always spelled with the initial capital, and with a plausible suggestion of a play upon words in more than one instance [as in 1, 67, 95, 109]. . . . Here are the elements of a theory"—a theory facetiously put forth earlier by WALSH (ed. 1908, p. 21). Why, indeed, nobody has uncovered a historical Billy Rose as Sh.'s friend is inexplicable.

Meantime, the Hughes legend had flourished. "It is barely possible," HUDSON (ed. 1856, p. 117) told his readers, that one Hughes, "a personal friend of the Poet's," was the recipient of a few of the sonnets, including 20, and "the *procurer* of the whole series for publication." Then in 1873 C. E. BROWNE (*Athenaeum*, August 30, p. 277), all innocently, started a myth that is hard to crush. "The allusion" in 20, he wrote, "may be to the Christian name Hugh or to the surname Hughes." Sh. was probably acquainted with "Will. Hewes, . . . the favourite musician of the old Earl of Essex" mentioned by the latter's secretary Edward Waterhouse. Browne, it should be remembered, did not seek to identify Mr. W. H. with Essex's musician. Indeed, he categorically asserts (the same, September 13, pp. 335 f.) that since Mr. W. H. was the "inspirer" of the sonnets, it is "impossible" for him to have been this particular Hewes, whom he had found in W. B. DEVEREUX's *Lives and Letters of the Devereux*, 1853 (I, 145). WILDE (*Blackwood's*, 1889, CXLVI, 17) also mentioned

Essex's Hewes, only to reject him as "impossible."¹ The latter is probably the "contemporary musician called William Hughes" referred to by LEE in 1898 (*Life*, p. 93 n.).

Browne got his information, as has been said, from W. B. DEVEREUX, who quotes Waterhouse's account of the death of Walter Devereux, first Earl of Essex, on September 22, 1576: "the night before he died, he called William Hewes, which was his musician, to play upon the virginal and to sing. 'Play,' said he, 'my song, Will Hewes. . .'" According to CAMDEN's *Annales* (ed. Thomas Hearne, 1717, I, xcvi), however, Waterhouse's words were: "the daie before he dyed he called William Howes the phisicion to play upon the Virginalles and to singe. Play, said he, my songe Will Howes. . ." Now it is true that *Hewes* is the name given in the narrative of Essex preserved in MS. Harleian 293, fol. 72 (according to STOPES, *William Hunnis*, 1910, p. 178), and in Bodleian MS. Top. Oxon. e. 5, pp. 146 f. (so my friend RUTH HUGHEY informs me). Nevertheless, Devereux printed from Richard Broughton's papers, in which, according to their modern editor, H. E. MALDEN (*Camden Miscellany*, 1924, XIII [iii], 9), the name is Hayes: "the night before he died, he willed William Hayes his musicion to playe on the virgynalls, and to sing. 'Playe,' said he, 'my songe. . .'" In any case, Howes, Hayes, or Hewes is referred to in the most casual way as a virginals player.

Will Hewes may or may not be the creation of an orthographical or transcriptional error; but his connection with the sonnets arose from Devereux's misreading of a passage in the Broughton papers.² After such a dubious origin, it is small wonder that his fame and ill fame have grown inordinately. REICHEL (*Gegenwart*, 1902, LXII, 251) transforms Hewes into the "musically educated catamite" of the first Earl of Essex, who praised him in some of the sonnets, and the devoted servitor of the second Earl of Essex, after whose death he turned the sonnets of both men (that is, most of Q) over to Bacon for publication. STOTSENBURG (*Impartial Study*, 1904, pp. 230 f.) assigns Essex's musician the peculiar task of conveying Sidney's sonnets to Thorpe, who basely published them under Sh.'s name. Next C. R. HAINES (*Quarterly*, 1922, CCXXXVII, 2) suggests that Sh.'s friend Hughes was "the son of Will. Hews, musician to Walter Devereux," and W. G. BEKKER (*Historical . . . Review of Samuel Butler's . . . Works*, 1925, p. 223) also thinks this son (of whose existence there is no record) "a more likely person" than the Hewes of Butler's theory. RICE (*Story of Hamlet*, 1924, p. 423) even magnifies Essex's obscure servant into one "who enjoyed a great reputation as a musician," as "the

¹ But in the enlarged *Portrait of Mr W. H.*, 1921 ed., p. 102, WILDE said, "It is just possible that this young actor [Willie Hughes] may, after all, have been in his boyhood the musician of Lord Essex." Wilde, who was writing fiction, had also light-heartedly called attention (CXLVI, 17) to Margaret Hughes, the actress-mistress of Prince Rupert (she bore him a daughter in 1673); and a reviewer in the *Bookmart*, 1889, VII, 162, with unseemly haste, commented, "Perhaps Mr. W. H. was the son of the musician and the father, or uncle, of the actress."

² BUTLER (ed. 1899, p. 115) says that this Hewes's "existence, I am now informed, is disbelieved in."

Paderewski of the period." With his reputation thus restored we may leave him until the next book on Sh. appears.

To resume chronology. FURNIVALL in 1876 (*N. & Q.*, June 3, pp. 443 f.) listed various Elizabethans named William Hughes (Hewes), but he expressed no belief that any one of them was Mr. W. H. Ten years later, W. D. O'CONNOR (*Hamlet's Note-Book*, p. 53) found in the sonnets (they were composed by Raleigh) an unspecified "allusion to that great Earl of Northumberland [1564-1632], celebrated for his beauty and learning, confined in the Tower with Raleigh, with one of his 'Magi,' his salaried scholar, William Hews, allowed access to him." But, unluckily for this cloudy sentence, Northumberland's magus was the mathematician, Thomas Hughes. Then in "The Portrait of Mr W. H." WILDE (*Blackwood's*, 1889, CXLVI, 7) presented as fiction the theory that Willie Hughes was a "wonderful boy-actor of great beauty, to whom he [Sh.] intrusted the presentation of his noble heroines," and who quit Sh.'s company "to play at a rival theatre, probably in some of Chapman's plays"—as is told in 78, 79, and 86. Taking Wilde's fiction as almost historical truth, BUTLER (ed. 1899, p. 65) asserted that the only plausible conjecture about Mr. W. H. makes him "a person named William Hughes, or Hewes, or Hews," though (p. 115) "it is not likely . . . that we shall learn more about him than what the Sonnets" and the dedication "reveal to us." Actually they revealed a great deal to Butler, who never dreamed of doubting that Thorpe's Mr. W. H. and Sh.'s fair friend were identical, and who dragged the former into the titles of the sonnets and his commentary with maddening persistence. In 1609 Mr. W. H. (pp. 117 f.) "was in great straits for money, and was glad of the few shillings which were all that Thorpe would be likely to give him for the copy." Neither he nor Thorpe "bore any ill-will to Shakespeare; money difficulties on the part of the first, and the hope of making a few pounds on that of the other, will explain their action, though nothing can excuse it." Here procurer, inspirer, friend coalesce into the Perfect One. Looking around for a plausible candidate—who could not be (pp. 60-65) highborn and wealthy, and who had to be born (p. 114) in 1567 or 1568—Butler purely by guess hit (p. 115) upon a William Hughes, or Hewes, about whose life he knew practically nothing at all. That person, an old sailor and a steward on the ships *Vanguard*, *Swiftsure*, and *Dreadnought*, applied (*Calendar of State Papers, Domestic . . .*, 1633-1634, 1863, pp. 517, 555) to the Lords of the Admiralty for the post of cook on the *Vanguard*, and they were graciously pleased to give him this assignment on March 19, 1634. Hughes the cook was dead (the same for 1636-1637, 1867, p. 39) by March 28, 1636.

Butler's sea-cook has aroused considerable and not undeserved mirth. Yet BEECHING (ed. 1904, p. xliii) does good service in reminding his readers that a Hughes theory (not Butler's) has an advantage over others, because "if it cannot be proved, neither can it be disproved. . . . People are not even now chronicled in dictionaries of biography simply for their good looks. We cannot deny that there may have been a young gentleman of family and fortune called William Hughes . . . whose handsome face and gentle manners won the poet's affection." HEMINGWAY (*M. L. N.*, 1910, XXV, 210) also writes: "20, 135, 136, and 143 would indicate that Mr. W. H. was Mr. William Hughes . . .

[a musician]. The eighth sonnet . . . has far greater significance if we may assume that it is addressed to a musician." But here is manifested the old, unprovable identification of the publisher's friend and the poet's.

Willie Hughes has shown enormous vitality for a man who is a figment of the imagination. W. B. BROWN (*N. & Q.*, March 29, April 5, 1913, pp. 241-243, 262 f.) recognized puns on his name in the oft-repeated words *use* and *unused*, *form*, *image*, *shape*, *shadow*, "which refer to the semblances or *hews* of the friend in Shakespeare's heart." But WILDE in 1889 (pp. 7, 11) had anticipated this recognition by commenting on puns in *use* and *usury* and by explaining that "the word 'shadow' had . . . a technical meaning connected with the stage." The actor Willie Hughes continues to bring plaudits to his non-serious originator. In 1922 one of the characters in Joyce's *Ulysses* (p. 190) called Wilde's "the most brilliant of all" the theories; and in 1931 ANDRÉ GIDE told Julian Green (*Personal Record*, trans. J. Godefroi, 1939, p. 66) that Wilde's "is the only, not merely plausible, but possible interpretation of the sonnets addressed to the unknown man." DOUGLAS (*True History*, 1933, p. 15) was sure that Butler had proved W. H. to be one Hughes, but he preferred Wilde's actor to the cook. PERCY ALLEN (*Anne Cecil*, 1934, pp. 22 f., 261 f., 266) accepted the Wilde-Butler name but added the refinement that William Hughes was the actor son of Lord Oxford and Queen Elizabeth, born about 1574 (see p. 165, above). CLARKSON (*Saturday Review of Literature*, May 4, 1935, p. 13) stumbled on a William Hughes, of Gray's Inn, who translated the *Mirror of Justices*, 1646, from the French of Andrew Horne (the British Museum catalog credits him with a number of other books), and who possibly was the student of that name entering Jesus College, Oxford, in 1604 or 1607. The "hesitancy" with which Clarkson suggested this candidate for Mr. W. H.'s role appears to be abundantly justified. In 1938 DOUGLAS (*T. L. S.*, May 21, p. 353), disputing a reviewer's statement (the same, May 14, p. 334) that "Willie Hughes, the pretty actor-boy, has nearly faded out," insisted that his own information was "exactly the reverse." Pursuing his investigations, he learned (the same, May 28, p. 370) that a William Hewes was admitted to the freedom of the city of Canterbury in 1593 after serving as "apprentice to John Marloe, shoemaker." Douglas, borrowing a hint from Wilde, found it "not difficult to suppose" that Christopher Marlowe took his father's former apprentice "to London and introduced him to the stage, probably as an actor to perform female parts and that he would thus almost inevitably meet Shakespeare." Fuller details, for which we await impatiently, are promised "in the projected new edition of my 'The History of Shakespeare's Sonnets'"; but A. J. A. SYMONS (the same, June 18, p. 417) was converted instantaneously. In the meanwhile G. S. VIERECK's Wandering Jew (*My First Two Thousand Years*, 1928) had met Willie Hewes, an actor who (p. 400) "is positively enchanting as Juliet," and to whom Sh. "dedicated" his sonnets. Willie, however (pp. 406 f.), turns out to be a girl, as Sh. knew when he wrote 20. "He called me master-mistress of his passion," she says blushing.

It is amusing to think that, in spite of his large following, William Hughes—like Essex's musician—may owe his existence to an error of transcription or typography. He would in all likelihood never have been heard of except for the line, "A man in hew all *Hews* in his controwling" (20.7), and BEECHING,

POOLER, and TANNENBAUM (see Textual Notes) made the clever and far from improbable suggestions that the line should run, "A maiden hue all . . .," "A woman's hue all . . .," or "A maid in hue all . . ." BYVANCK (*Book of Homage to Sh.*, 1916, p. 471 n.) also argued that lines 5-8 do not belong to the sonnet as Sh. wrote it. The quatrain in 20 (as in 1, 3, 132) is an excrescence, for "the *motif* of this sonnet is the word *woman*, and it is quite spoiled by the intervening quatrain." He is pleased thus to get rid of these "ridiculous" lines "which have cost so many heart- and head-breakings."

Even granting that Sh. wrote "*Hews*" as a play on a personal name, it does not follow that his friend actually was named Hews, or Hughes.¹ "If one were to amuse oneself with fancied discoveries," DOWDEN (ed. 1881, p. 208) queried, "why not insist on the fact that this mysterious *Hews* contains the initials of both W. H. and W. S.?" Such insistence has frequently been made—with varying results. One may accept or reject H. D. GRAY's statement (*P. M. L. A.*, 1915, XXX, 634 n.), "The type of pun . . . seems to me so uncharacteristic that the italicized word gives us the only name which Shakespeare's friend could *not* have borne"; or one may agree with MASSEY (ed. 1888, pp. 53 f.) that *Hews* is a play on *Ewe*, one of Lord Essex's titles, Sh.'s meaning being that his friend's "comeliness and favour were far superior to those" of the queen's favorite. Other noblemen lurk in the italics, as Lord Fitzhew, or Pembroke (see p. 203, below). Again, RATTRAY (*T. L. S.*, April 12, 1928, p. 272) explained "*Hews*" as an anagram of "*Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton*" (WALSH [ed. 1908, p. 17] had done so earlier in jest and G. H. SKIPWITH [*T. L. S.*, July 6, 1916, p. 321] and ACHESON [*Sh.'s Sonnet Story*, 1922, p. 58] in earnest), saying, "If 'Will Hews' was a nickname or incognito of Southampton the dedication would be explained perfectly"; and CRIPPS (the same, May 28, 1938, p. 370) reached the same conclusion, though without calling on anagram: "'Hews' might stand for 'He.W.S.': which leads us directly to 'He(nry) W(riothlesley Earl of) S(outhampton).' " WALSH (ed. 1908, pp. 17 f.) had jokingly called attention to a possible "fusing" here of the initials of Southampton ("*He.W.*") and Sh. ("*W. S.*"). Only a little different was the opinion of WALTER THOMSON (*Sonnets of William Sh.*, 1938), who calls (p. 30) Willie Hughes as supposititious a creature as "Willie 'Interim,' Willie 'Abysm,' Willie 'Audit,' Willie 'Heretic,' and more than twenty other Willies." He then surmises (p. 85), "with much diffidence," that "the two-in-one name of 'W. H.' [is] formed by the initials of the Christian names of William Shakespeare and Henry Wriothesley respectively"—the two authors of the sonnets. This seems to him "much more applicable and convincing than any other name yet put forward." Proof is found (pp. 78-85) in the language of the *P. & T.*, especially the lines,

Single Natures double name,
Neither two nor one was called.

¹ BELL (ed. 1855, p. 163 n.) had said: "We are equally at liberty to conjecture that they [the sonnets] were addressed to a person whose Christian name was Hugh, which would give a much more perfect play to the conceit [in 20.7]." If the friend actually had been named W. Hews, the line should have run, "A man in hews all hews," and so on.

HENRY WRIOTHESLEY, THIRD EARL OF SOUTHAMPTON

Henry Wriothesley, third Earl of Southampton, was surprisingly late in being nominated as the fair youth of the sonnets. Born on October 6, 1573, some nine years after Sh., and succeeding to the earldom on October 4, 1581, he became an acknowledged patron of various Elizabethan authors. He "is the only patron of Shakespeare who is positively known to biographers," the current *D. N. B.* (1909, XXI, 1056) asserts; and the dedications of *Venus* and *Lucrece* automatically made him an inevitable candidate for the friend praised by the sonneteer. It is odd that William Harte and William Hughes made their entrance before him; but his popularity has far surpassed and outlasted theirs. DRAKE (*Sh. and His Times*, 1817, II, 62-71) was the first person publicly to designate Wriothesley as the friend. Dating the sonnets from 1594 to 1609 (see p. 53 n., above), he gave so-called proof that may be summarized thus: the language of the *Lucrece* dedication is duplicated in 26; the friend is called in 78 Sh.'s literary patron; Southampton, whose marriage to Vernon was bitterly opposed by the queen, may have declared "*that if he could not marry the object of his choice, he would die single*," this being "a complete key" to the hitherto inexplicable opening sonnets; after Southampton's secret marriage to Vernon in 1598 there was no need for further poems like 1-17; and even in 126, composed in 1609 when the earl was thirty-six, Sh. calls him a lovely boy, being determined to consider him still as young as he was when the opening sonnets were written for his guidance.

Stated thus baldly, DRAKE's "evidence" seems far too inadequate for the conviction it carried, and still carries. He boasted (II, 63) that his comments on the resemblance of 26 to the *Lucrece* dedication (a resemblance, by the way, greatly overemphasized) called attention to a "hitherto unnoticed fact." BOSWELL (ed. 1821, p. 249), however, unkindly remarked that CAPELL's note on this very matter (in Malone, ed. 1780, p. 602) probably "suggested to Dr. Drake his theory," which (p. 218) "will not bear the test of examination." "In the reign of Elizabeth," Boswell (p. 219) continued, "the distinctions of rank . . . were so scrupulously maintained, that it is difficult to believe that Shakspeare, in a comparatively humble situation of life, would have presumed to employ terms of such familiarity, and even, in one instance [evidently 20], of such grossness, when writing to a distinguished nobleman, his patron, or would have ventured to remonstrate with him on a topick which an equal would scarcely have found himself at liberty to touch upon. . . . [Also] the sort of praise . . . [found therein] was little calculated to conciliate his favour." In Germany, however, Drake's book created a strong and lasting impression. PLATEN in 1821 (*Tagebücher*, 1900, II, 503) and TIECK in 1826 (*Penelope Taschenbuch*, pp. 315-317; see also his novel, *Dichterleben*, part II, 1829) accepted it as a gospel. Southampton was in London as early as 1590, Tieck writes; he loved poetry and the drama, and he may possibly have sought out Sh. The poet urged Southampton to marry; the latter was "the only son of a father who had died young. Consequently, the family probably agreed with the poet's wishes."

ANNA JAMESON (*Memoirs of the Loves of the Poets*, 1829 [1833, I, 208 f.]) hastened to follow Drake's lead, but shortly afterward BOADEN started a new

game with his "discovery" of the friend in Pembroke. His objections to Southampton (*G. M.*, 1832, CII, ii, 220 f.) have been reiterated a thousand times without making an impression on true believers. W. H. is not Henry Wriothesley. When Sh. began to write the sonnets in 1594 after the publication of *Lucrece*, he was thirty, Southampton twenty-one. Yet he speaks of himself as in the autumn and his friend in the spring of life, the "louely Boy" being mentioned in 126, the last of the friendship group (which Boaden supposed to be arranged in chronological order of writing). The earl, as his portraits testify, had no personal beauty. Why do the sonnets praise only Southampton's looks and make no reference to naval feats of 1596¹ and 1597, his marriage and imprisonment in 1598, his journey with Essex to Ireland in the next year, his trial and imprisonment after the Essex rebellion? In the light of these negations, Boaden felt justified in saying that "the Sonnets *cannot* apply to Lord Southampton."

Presumably his magazine articles attracted little attention abroad (they were first issued in book-form in 1837), and so in France DE WAILLY (*Revue des deux mondes*, 1834, 3d series, IV, 691 f.) adopted Drake's Southampton theory, while in Germany REGIS (*Sh.-Almanach*, 1836, pp. 247-250), emulating both Drake and Tieck, repeated the old and added a few new arguments, cautiously labeling them as making for probability, not definite proof. In the dedication Regis saw the initials W. H. (p. 298 n.) as perhaps reversed for "Wriothesly Henry," though (p. 361) more likely they might also mean "Wriothesly Hampton (abbreviated for Southampton)," the abbreviation used in the Virginia place-name Hampton Roads. The latter suggestion has met with small favor, the former with much. Thus CARL HEBLER (*Aufsätze über Sh.*, 1864 [1874, p. 14 n.]) explained that Thorpe transposed H. W. in the dedication just "as in the forged letter of Olivia to Malvolio [*Twelfth Night*, II.v] the latter's name is indicated by the letters M, O, A, and J." That Sh. or Thorpe made such a transposition was asserted as possible or certain by A. HALL (*Academy*, 1897, LII, 118), SARRAZIN (*Jahrbuch*, 1895, XXXI, 220; *Internationale Monatsschrift*, 1914, VIII, 1078), SAINTSBURY (*C. H. E. L.*, 1910, V, 252), NOYES, 1924 (*New Essays*, 1927, pp. 103 f.), and countless others.

ULRICI in 1839 (see p. 196, below) won the distinction of being the first German scholar to accept Boaden's Pembroke theory. But Southampton remained, and remains to this day, the favorite of Germans. To the discussion about him WAGNER (*Sh.'s Gedichte*, 1840, pp. ix f.), GERVINUS (*Sh. Commentaries* [1849], 1863, I, 624-631), BODENSTEDT (*Aus der Heimat und Fremde*, 1856, I, 214), and MÉZIÈRES (*Sh. ses œuvres*, 1860, p. 54) added nothing of importance. But in England CARTWRIGHT (ed. 1859, p. 5) contributed the "highly probable" suggestion² that *Venus* "was written with the good intention of rousing the dormant feelings of his [Sh.'s] chaste and virtuous friend,

¹ In the current *D. N. B.*, 1909, XXI, 1057, LEE says: "In 1596 he withdrew from court and played a part as a volunteer with his friend Essex in the military and naval expedition to Cadiz." But see p. 57, above.

² Repeated in part by ACHESON (*Sh.'s Sonnet Story*, 1922, pp. 53-58) and A. K. GRAY (*P. M. L. A.*, 1924, XXXIX, 608 f.) with no reference to Cartwright.

and stimulating him to marriage; but, unfortunately, the poem was published after the Earl had become acquainted with Marlowe [the rival], and subject to the influence of his immoral character." When Sh. recovered from the shock, he wrote *Lucrece* "as peculiarly applicable under existing circumstances, and as an excellent vehicle for delivering a lecture on morality—not only to his young friend, but especially to the lady." W. C. J.'s contribution (*Athenaeum*, August 20, 1859, p. 250) was that Southampton's motto, "Vng par tout, tout par vng," is referred to in 8, 31, 105, "and in many of the others it will be found to be the pervading thought."

To glance again at Germany, JORDAN (*Sh.'s Gedichte*, 1861, pp. xxx f.) considered the friendship between Sh. and Southampton as significant in the former's poetic development as that of Goethe and Schiller. All the poems except the *P. P.* are a monument of the fruitful spiritual union of the actor and the earl. Sh. (p. liii) "clearly understood that he could achieve his high goal only if the loving hand of the friend helped him up from the slimy ground to the first rung of the ladder over the topmost round of which shone the star of immortality," and so a part of his fame rightfully belongs to the earl. Similar dogmatic assertions were made by BEKK (*William Sh.*, 1864, p. 54), E. W. SIEVERS (*William Sh.*, 1866, pp. 91 f.), NEIDHARDT (*Sh.'s kleinere Dichtungen*, 1870, p. vii), and KREYSSIG (*Vorlesungen über Sh.*, 3d ed., 1877, I, 114). The last was for a time agnostic (see his *Sh.-Fragen*, 1871, p. 66), but the combined weight of German opinion was too heavy for him to combat. DELIUS (*Jahrbuch*, 1865, I, 24-28), however, remained agnostic, and his example encouraged SIMROCK (*Sh.'s Gedichte*, 1867, pp. ix-xviii) to write of the Southampton case as unproved.

FLEAY (*Macmillan's*, 1875, XXXI, 433-445) now presented a series of highly fanciful views in the guise of facts. He regarded Mr. W. H. and the friend as independent beings. The latter (p. 435) is Southampton, "the only person who had a right to have any 'jealousy' as to Shakspeare's idleness. . . . Shakspeare had promised him another poem, and had not fulfilled his promise; he had been writing for the theatre instead." Hence *absence, journey, travel* (see I, 188) "do not refer to any actual journey at all; but merely to the separation between Southampton and Shakspeare caused by the metaphorical unfaithfulness of the latter to the former, in producing, not poems dedicated to him, but only dramas destined for the multitude." Again (p. 436), *jade* and *horse* mean Pegasus. Accordingly (pp. 442, 445), 1-126 are Sh.'s defense for not writing and dedicating further poems to Southampton. By this interpretation Sh.'s "moral character" is "freed from the shameful stigma that has been branded on it by his critics." ELZE in 1876 (*William Sh.*, 1888, p. 176) stigmatized the Southampton case as "very doubtful"; but FLEAY (*Chronicle History*, 1886, pp. 120 f.) declared that the friend "was proved by Drake" to be Southampton on "conclusive" evidence; that (*Biographical Chronicle*, 1891, II, 208 f.) he is Southampton "beyond doubt," and "only dilettanti or faddists of a clique" can deny it. One can only be glad that he was not dispensing judgments in a law court.

SARRAZIN (*Jahrbuch*, 1895, XXXI, 220 f.) thought all the details of the "friendship sonnets" applicable only to Southampton: his father was dead (9.1); he was twenty when the first sonnets were written in 1594, just half the

age mentioned in 2.1. Sh. seems to have been intimate with the earl and to have known his widowed mother: perhaps he visited the former's country estate in the summer and autumn of 1593, in which case the travel sonnets (27, 28, 50, 51) become clearer. Again (*Aus Sh.'s Meisterwerkstatt*, 1906, p. 101), after comparing 23.13, 26.1-6, and especially 105.1-4 with the *Lucrece* dedication, SARRAZIN decided that no possible doubt of the friend's name could remain: "No poet will dedicate such expressions of love and reverence to several persons *at the same time* or even about the same time, especially since these expressions, because of their uniqueness, refer to one personality. Whoever declares that William Herbert or some other nobleman is the friend of the sonnets accuses the poet (in . . . 105 . . .) of a lie, and indeed of a lie which (by means of the *Lucrece* dedication) can easily be refuted. The identity of 'Mr. W. H.' with the earl, Henry Wriothesley, is therefore an hypothesis only in the sense that Shakespeare's authorship of the sonnets is an hypothesis. We can prove the truth of neither the one nor the other with complete documentary certainty. But whoever can be convinced by methods of historical proof will accept both hypotheses with equal faith." Later still the same writer (*Internationale Monatsschrift*, 1914, VIII, 1081, 1090-1096) announced that in *Romeo and Juliet* Sh. was making use of the Southampton-Vernon romance. With vaulting imagination he then traced the break-up of the friendship. It was caused by the earl's activities outside London and England, his involvement in affairs beyond Sh.'s scope. The poet was not among those who congratulated Southampton on his release from imprisonment in 1603, and the publication of Q no doubt angered the earl.

BOAS (*Sh. and His Predecessors*, 1896, p. 118 n.) dismissed Southampton as an "inconceivable" candidate—how could he "be spoken of over and over again [as in 135] as 'Will' "? He was easily conceivable to GOLLANCZ (ed. 1896) and to VON DANCKELMAN (*Sh. in seinen Sonetten*, 1897, pp. 5-10). The latter found traces of the *Lucrece* dedication, which eighty years before had started the squabble, in 38, 39, 76, 78, 79, and 105. GOLLANCZ (pp. xiii f.) confessed: "At the present moment the star of William Herbert is in the ascendant. Many a former ally of Southampton [but not the writer] has rallied round the banner unfurled by . . . Tyler." The situation was reversed with great suddenness in 1897, when the volume of the *D. N. B.* containing LEE's biography of Sh. appeared. In earlier volumes (see pp. 199-201, below) he had categorically sworn allegiance to Pembroke; in the 1897 volume he was metamorphosed into an ardent Southamptonite. Undismayed by a favorable review of Lee's sketch in the *Academy*, 1897 (LII, 23), TYLER (the same, pp. 78 f.), with a degree of wishful thinking, retorted, "It has been justly said that the Southampton theory is dead; and I am pretty firmly persuaded that neither Mr. Lee nor even Mr. Gollancz . . . will be able to effect a resuscitation."

Rallying to the endangered cause, WILLIAM ARCHER marshaled evidence to show "The Case against Southampton" (*Fortnightly*, 1897, LXVIII, 817-834). According to his view (p. 826), "the case for Southampton rests wholly and solely" on the alleged resemblance between 26 and the *Lucrece* dedication.¹

¹ If so, WOLFGANG SCHMIDT, himself a Southamptonite, in 1938 made the

The resemblance is easily disposed of, for it shows only (p. 825) that "similar situations beget similar expressions." If, in fact, Southampton had been the youth of the sonnets, Sh. would have taken care *not* to duplicate his earlier words. Hence, "26 is of no evidential value one way or the other." Southampton (p. 828) is unrecognizable as "the beautiful and effeminate creature" of 1-126: "he was certainly not remarkable for his beauty." Moreover, "his life was full of marked and stirring events" in 1596-1603 to which the sonnets make not the slightest allusion. Besides (pp. 829-834), two strong pieces of direct evidence militate against him: the quibbles on the friend's name in 134-136, supported by the dedication of Q, "make it as clear as daylight" that Sh.'s friend was named Will.

LEE at once (*Fortnightly*, 1898, LXIX, 210-223) hurled a spear at Archer. More than a decade later E. S. BATES (*M. P.*, 1910, VIII, 87) said that by 1898 "all existing biographical interpretations" of the sonnets were discredited, and that in the literary jousting of Archer and Lee "each warrior successfully unhorsed his opponent." But neither warrior admitted being unhorsed. Each instead, claiming the prize of victory, remounted his fiery steed, and led processions of practically equal length. Their respective followers were completely reassured by the invincible weapons and armor of the two champions. Without once referring to his own apostasy, LEE wrote another long magazine article about his new hero (*Cornhill*, 1898, n. s., IV, 482-495), detecting traces (pp. 489 f.) of the *Lucrece* dedication in 26, 32, 38, with "fainter echoes" (p. 492 n.) in 37, 39, 74, 108, 110;¹ and he expanded his *D. N. B.* sketch into the *Life*, 1898, the first important full-length biography of Sh. That book, much changed and enlarged in subsequent editions, remains today the standard life of the poet. The *D. N. B.* itself was revised, so that all support of Pembroke and Fitton as the friend and the dark woman disappeared from its pages. As the author of the *D. N. B.* sketches and of the one generally consulted separate biography, Lee gave Southampton an unfair advantage. The average person who skims through those works may well be pardoned for believing the case for him proved and closed.

Nothing was added by SANFELICE (*Rivista d'Italia*, 1898, III, 309-313)—who, retailing old arguments, informed his Italian readers that 1-126 (but not the rest) were "consecrated," if not dedicated, to Southampton—or by HENRY (*Sonnets de Sh.*, 1900, pp. xiv-xvi), who asserted that "the majority of French critics" had adopted the Southampton theory. In Germany, too, WOLFF (*Sh.'s Sonette*, 1903, pp. xiv-xvi; *Shakespeare*, 1907, I, 293-302) restated the Southampton case, with various borrowings from Lee. But BEECHING, an opponent of both the noble earls, noted (ed. 1904, p. xxxii) that as Lee gives 107 the date 1603, then the envoy to the first series of sonnets, 126, must necessarily not be earlier than 1603, when Southampton was thirty. He thought it incredible that any man so old, especially in Elizabethan times, should have been

whole Southampton structure totter and fall when (see p. 51, above) he challenged the authenticity of 26. EICHHOFF and STALKER (pp. 47, 51, above) also deny Sh.'s authorship of it.

¹ FLEAY (*Biographical Chronicle*, 1891, II, 216) had found "repeated references," as in 18, 26, 34, 81, 108, "&c."

called by Sh. a "louely Boy." Beeching believed that this argument overthrew Lee's, but of course it depends on the assumption that the position of 126 in Q is correct—an assumption very commonly disputed. Once again BEECHING (in Bullen, ed. 1907, p. 365) objected that while Sh. belonged to the degraded profession of acting, Southampton "was one of the greatest peers in England," and so "such addresses [in the sonnets] from a player, however fashionable, to a patron, however complaisant, were simply impossible."

Wearisome repetition marks the discussions of GENÉE (*William Sh.*, 1905, pp. 180-182), BRANDL (*Sh.'s Sonette*, 1913, pp. xxxiv-xxxviii; *Shakespeare*, 1922, 1937, pp. 145 f.), SIEPER (*Sh. und seine Zeit*, 1913, p. 63), KELLER (*Sh.'s Werke*, 1916, XV, 117-119), and other Southamptonites out of number. Among them were two renegades, WÜLKER (*Geschichte der englischen Literatur*, 1906, I, 332) and STOPES, who deserted Pembroke under the guidance of Lee. Stopes in various articles (for example, the *Athenaeum*, March 19, 26, 1898, pp. 374 f., 405 f.) and finally in a long biography, 1922, became an able helper of Southampton's cause.

Most people in Germany, LANDAUER remarked in 1920 (*Shakespeare*, II, 322), take it as self-evident that the sonnets were meant for Sh.'s patron, Southampton. He himself favored Pembroke. Two earlier German rebels may be mentioned. SCHÜCKING (*Sh. im literarischen Urteil*, 1908, pp. 99 f.) stressed the point that Elizabethan patrons treated their authors badly; as witness *The Return from Parnassus*, part I, 1600 (ed. W. D. Macray, 1886, pp. 34-36), and Jonson's statement (*Conversations*, 1619 [ed. Harrison, 1923, p. 14]) that poets invited to dinner by their patrons received other food than their hosts. Accordingly, anyone who thinks that a friendship could exist under these circumstances between Sh. and Southampton, completely disregards actual conditions. To CONRAD (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, 1919, CLXXVII, 220-225) only one thing in favor of Southampton is known: to him Sh. dedicated two poems. But dedications are no evidence whatever of intimate friendship. Instead poets expected a cash acknowledgment; and when they were on terms of intimacy with noblemen, they did not address dedications and sonnet cycles to them. Conrad rejected as worthless the evidence of 26 and brought an optic glass to bear on Southampton's alleged beauty. "Lee produces a picture of the youthful earl, whose mustache and beard are beginning to sprout; he has obviously chosen the handsomest of the fourteen existing portraits of Southampton. We see a young fellow in whom the dimension of length is most unfortunately the only obvious attribute: a long, slender torso, with long arms, rests on long, thin legs, the calves of which have neither developed muscles nor fat. The neck offers pleasing variety: it is rather short; but above it an extraordinarily long face is stretched: its long straight nose recalls the conformation of a horse's head. His eyes have not the fire of a thoroughbred, but stare at us sleepily." This amusingly subjective and biased sketch ends: "If the body of Helen had had even the slightest resemblance to that of young Southampton, the Trojan War would never have broken out, and the *Iliad* would have remained unwritten."

Because Southampton's good looks have been so bitterly challenged (STOPES [*Saturday Review*, 1922, CXXXIII, 385] says that "many other poets besides Shakespeare did refer to Southampton's beauty," but cites only one example,

Philip Stringer, in Latin verses of 1592), the reader may wish to determine the truth for himself. Reproductions of numerous portraits of the earl were made by the Walpole Society, 1920 (VIII, 17-94). In them he appears to me handsome—even beautiful!—enough, though far less “majestic” than Pembroke; but my impression may involve an optical delusion, for C. CLARK (*Sh. and Psychology*, 1936, p. 140) assures me that Southampton lacked all personal beauty. Has not debating reached a low level when a man’s good looks or bad looks are supposed to turn the scale? If his friend actually was as ugly as a black dwarf, Sh. might all the more eagerly have painted flattering pictures, making him seem lovelier than a summer’s day. It is difficult to see beauty in portraits of the aging queen; but Elizabethan poets saw, or pretended to see, as much beauty in her face at sixty as at twenty-five.

Incidental “evidence” for Southampton has been presented in abundance. HELENE RICHTER (*Sh. der Mensch*, 1923, p. 71), for example, imagines that by the time he wrote 107 (that is, in 1603), Sh. no longer felt an ardent warmth for Southampton. Now forty and at the height of his career, he needed no patron; and since Sh. would never have abandoned a person he really loved, we may be certain “that his relations with Southampton were from the very beginning not that romantic, over-fervent sort of permanent bond of friendship” which tradition has made them. RICHTER more or less repeated these ideas in 1930 (*Sh.s Gestalten*, pp. 9 f.). FRIPP (*Master Richard Quyny*, 1924, p. 68) asserts that in 1-26 Sh. is urging Southampton, “in the conventional fashion of Wilson (after Erasmus) in *The Art of Rhetoric* [1553, 1560, ed. G. H. Mair, 1909, pp. 39-63], to marry”—but the assertion might just as well apply to Pembroke. POLLARD (*Library*, March, 1925, p. 376) takes another tack. The highly amorous *Venus* “was specially licensed by the Archbishop of Canterbury,” a fact suggesting that “Southampton was sufficiently pleased with the poem to bespeak the Archbishop’s favour for it.” Here Pollard—and his words are borrowed by ALEXANDER (*Sh.’s Life*, 1939, p. 92)—sees a strong indication that the earl and the poet became warm friends immediately after their first meeting. ARTHUR LYNCH (*London Review of Reviews*, 1930, LXXX, 310) discovers in 76.7, “That euery word doth almost fel my name,” the name “Hery Wrothslly,” which he thinks very significant.¹

MURRY (*Adelphi*, 1931, n. s., II, 203, 212 f.) presents an imaginary situation as real: by 1594 Sh., “the man of 29, had fallen in love with the young nobleman of 19. A ridiculous thing to do, perhaps. That is a matter of opinion.” “To Shakespeare, . . . sensitive in this matter of love, the publication [of the sonnets in 1609] must have been a fearful violation. And, ultimately, Southampton must have been responsible for it. Whether it was in deliberate malice, or indifferent contempt, or mere carelessness, that he allowed those sonnets to fall into the hands of an unscrupulous publisher, would have made no difference to the effect on Shakespeare. . . . [By 1609 the two were probably

¹ LYNCH had already announced his discovery in the *Book Monthly*, 1919, XIV, 543-546, 619-623. His supporter, GEORGE REWCASTLE (the same, p. 704), found in 26.14 an anagram which he deciphered as “Henrie Wriothlesley, Southampton, made me that vow.” For similar impressive evidence supplied by *Hews* (20.7) see p. 185, above.

estranged. But when Sh.] learned that his sonnets had been handed over to the gutter-press of those days, then the last veil of possible illusion was torn away. . . . There came a moment of brutal injustice to himself, when it seemed to him not merely that Southampton was vile: but he himself was viler still. He had deliberately deceived his own soul: he had pretended love where he had sought reward: he had . . . prostituted himself. The self-revelation, though false, was appalling." In the same vein J. D. WILSON (*Essential Sh.*, 1932, pp. 63-66) conjectures that Sh. met Southampton in April, 1593. "The meeting delighted both parties." The poet soon became "a member of the earl's household and remained with him for most of 1593 and part of 1594." There, at Titchfield, his "main occupation . . . was to provide . . . dramatic entertainment," and he wrote *Love's Labor's Lost*. By Christmas, 1594, he was back in the London theater.

The various articles and books of FORT (1924-1934), discussed elsewhere, are all postulated on the assumption that Southampton unquestionably was the friend. So, too, is the discussion of FERDINANDO NERI (*Saggi di letteratura*, 1936, p. 249). BROOKE in 1926 (*Sh. of Stratford*, pp. 136 n., 175) considered the assumption "doubtful." Ten years later (ed. 1936, pp. 78-81) he was as firm a believer as Fort; indeed, "the Earl of Southampton fits the date so exactly that it seems supererogatory to consider other suggestions." Even at the risk of boring repetition, it appears wise to enumerate Brooke's reasons—all of them old. Southampton was twenty on October 6, 1593, six months after *Venus* had been dedicated to him, seven months before the more affectionately phrased *Lucrece* dedication was published. His father was dead, his mother in May, 1594, was remarried—to Sir Thomas Heneage. He himself had been for some time engaged to Elizabeth Vere, granddaughter of his guardian Lord Burghley, but in November, 1594, "he secured release by paying the huge forfeiture of £5,000 in cash." In the summer and autumn of 1594 he was in retirement at his country seat, Titchfield, but by December 21 he had returned to London. All the sonnets were completed before his spectacular marriage to Elizabeth Vernon, August, 1598, which resulted in his imprisonment. "That an actor-playmaker who held as lowly an opinion of himself as . . . [Sh.] did should thus [in the sonnets] address an earl . . . is perhaps the strangest fact in Elizabethan social history, but it is a fact," for Sh. had dedicated *Venus* to him, he had told him in the *Lucrece* dedication "that what he has done is his, what he has to do is his, the earl 'being part in all I have, (who am) devoted (i. e. devotedly) yours.' There is no other Elizabethan dedication like this." Brooke's "fact" will appear to many readers a guess or an assumption, and they may recall instances in Elizabethan and later times of one book's carrying, in varying issues, warmly phrased dedications to different men. To illustrate, some copies of Robert Allot's *England's Parnassus*, 1600, were inscribed to Sir Thomas Monson, others to John Gibson. Brooke evidently made out the best case for Southampton that can be made, even though he hinges it on a date not later than 1597 for all the sonnets.

It is noteworthy that the Southamptonites spend a good part of their time in contradicting and refuting themselves and one another. Take the question of date. In the *D. N. B.*, 1897 (LI, 363), LEE said that the majority of the sonnets were written by 1594, probably all by 1598; while in the *Life*, 1898

(pp. 86 f.), he insisted that a number were composed at intervals up to 1603 (the date of 107). BRANDL and many other adherents of Southampton have agreed with Lee's second dating, whereas DRAKE had seen no difficulty in the assumption that some of the lyrics were composed as late as 1609. CHAMBERS (*William Sh.*, 1930, I, 565) had objected: if the case for Southampton "were sound, one would expect to find some hints in the sonnets of the major interests of Southampton's early life; his military ambitions, his comradeship with Essex, the romance of his marriage. There are none." BROOKE, however, makes the Southampton theory depend entirely on early dating. All the sonnets, in his opinion, were composed (p. 81) "before the end of 1596, or, at latest, the spring of 1597; for they contain no hint of matters which later could not have been ignored: the earl's plans to travel for a year, for which he received leave, March 2, 1597, his participation in the 'Islands Voyage,' July-October, 1597, his journey abroad, marriage, and imprisonment in 1598, his service in Ireland, and his unhappy part in the Essex rising." How is one to reconcile this pronouncement with LEE's rejoinder (*Fortnightly*, 1898, LXIX, 223) to Archer that Southampton's military experiences after 1596 "were mere episodes in his career," which Sh. had no reason to mention?¹ Brooke's views are refuted again by YOUNG (*Sonnets of Sh.*, 1937, pp. 53-64, 106-115), who tells that 1596 is the earliest possible date for *any* of the sonnets, and that Sh. continued to write them until 1601 when Southampton was imprisoned. Loyalty to the queen then made him stop, in spite of his steadfast love for the "convicted traitor." During 1601-1603 he sought another patron, and in 108-125 (written, like 107 and 126, in 1603 after Southampton's release) the theme is Southampton's reproaches for his protégé's disloyalty and the latter's apologies. These details are developed with great plausibility for such of the faithful as are not distressed by the dates. But no believer in Brooke's notions, and no unbelievers in Southampton, are likely to be converted to Young's peculiar religion.

In 1937 C. HINMAN (*T. L. S.*, October 2, 1937, p. 715), announcing that the Southampton theory is "quite generally accepted to-day," went into some detail to show that the eleven appearances of *Rose* in the sonnets may be a pun on the earl's family name of Wriothesley, which he thought may have been pronounced *Rose-ly*. Thinking so (and unaware [see the notes to 2] that his suggestion had been anticipated years before), Hinman found "the Sonnets richer in content and more pleasing than ever as poetry." His enjoyment may have been curtailed by A. F. POLLARD's prompt rejoinder (the same, October 9, p. 735). The name, Pollard insisted, was always called *Wrisley*.

Unaffected by the resurgence of the Pembrokists, WOLFGANG SCHMIDT (*Anglia*, 1938, LXII, 287) tells his readers that they may accept Southampton as the friend "almost with full assurance." HOTSON (*I, William Sh.*, 1937, pp. 101-103) is apparently of the same mind. Suggesting that Sir Henry Berkeley (stepfather of the Thomas Russell who was one of the two overseers

¹ It is noteworthy that Gervase Markham (*Honour in His Perfection*, 1624), who (sig. D3) "euer loued and admired this Earle, that liued many yeares where I daily saw this Earle," stresses nothing but Southampton's military and naval exploits, calling him (sig. E1) "the eldest sonne of *Honour* in this Army."

of Sh.'s will) introduced the poet to Southampton, he gives details about "the intimacy between the Berkeleys and the Wriothesleys," the bearing of which on the question at issue arouses some doubt. Southampton is favored by FRIPP (*Shakespeare*, 1938, I, 264-267, II, 713), ALEXANDER (*Sh.'s Life*, 1939, pp. 94 f.), and WOLLENBERG (*Shakespeare*, 1939, p. 97), but none has anything new to say.

There may, or may not, be consolation in the fact that many non-believers in Sh., like the Baconians BEGLEY (*Is It Sh.?*, 1903, p. 191), ROBERT FRAZER (*Silent Sh.*, 1915, p. 109), and RANDALL DAVIES (*Notes*, 1927, p. 10), have often welcomed the earl as the young man of the sonnets. LOONEY ("*Sh.*" *Identified*, 1920, pp. 437-445), too, and several of his disciples are just as confident that "Sh.," or Oxford, wrote them because he had in mind the proposed marriage of his daughter Elizabeth and Southampton. With an industry and ingenuity that looks like a cruel parody of the theories of the true believers they have worked the latter into countless new combinations and permutations.

WILLIAM HERBERT, THIRD EARL OF PEMBROKE

The news that William Herbert (1580-1630), third Earl of Pembroke, was Sh.'s friend was formally announced by BOADEN in 1832 (*G. M.*, CII, ii, 217-221, 308-314, 407). After his first article had appeared but before he had actually named Herbert, B. H. BRIGHT (the same, p. 296) published a melancholy letter, saying that in 1819 he had told Joseph Hunter of his "discovery" that 1-126 were addressed to Pembroke, while another friend, Dr. Holme, "had been informed of my secret a year earlier." HUNTER (the same) corroborated Bright's statements, expressing complete belief in his unfortunately anticipated "discovery." The credit for the misnamed discovery must go, however, to BOADEN, who professed to have made it some twenty years earlier—around 1812—and who elaborated it in a small book called *On the Sonnets*, 1837. To quote from the latter (p. 27): Boaden looked for a young man "who, from his youth and station, called for no other topics than the Sonnets afford; who was beautiful enough to be considered 'the world's fresh ornament;' interesting enough that the Poet should wish his *straying youth* removed from temptation; great enough to be courted, as willing and able to patronize a condition that could not exist without it, and who actually became the patron of Shakespeare; one moreover whom, as the Sonnets tell us, rival poets were courting, with all the arts, and more than the *charms* of verse." The real wonder is that Pembroke was so late in being brought forward. He was rich, notorious for sensuality but averse to marriage, a munificent patron of literary men ("the greatest Mecænas to learned men of any peer of his time or since," JOHN AUBREY said [*Natural History of Wiltshire*, ed. John Britton, 1847, p. 77]), and, above all, with his brother Philip, the dedicatee of the most important original volume ever published in the English language, the first folio Sh. of 1623. Boaden (pp. 32-34) makes much of that dedication, which is signed by the actors Heming and Condell, but which, he says without any justification, was actually penned by Jonson, so that "the facts stated acquire *his* full knowledge." That assertion weakened his case, just as the fact that the still-living Southampton was ignored strengthened it. Readers may wish to be reminded that the two actors, intimate acquaintances of Sh., in their address "To The Most Noble

And Incomparable Paire Of Brethren" say of "these remaines of your seruant *Shakespeare*": "But since your L. L. haue beene pleas'd to thinke these trifles some-thing, heeretofore; and haue prosecuted both them, and their Authour liuing, with so much fauour: we hope, that . . . you will vse the like indulgence toward them, you haue done vnto their parent." Naturally enough, Boaden decided (p. 34) "that Shakespeare addressed 126 of these Sonnets to Mr. WILLIAM HERBERT, subsequently third Earl of Pembroke, and that a variety of circumstances alluded to in these Sonnets, as well as the initials, apply fully, personally, and unequivocally to the said young nobleman; and that the other Sonnets, though not addressed, were sent to him, as alluding to matters mentioned in the 126; and that it is probable the Earl sanctioned their publication in 1609 under his untitled initials." Pembroke was then a courtier and statesman of importance. Hence Thorpe's use of his initials was "an obvious propriety." Further evidence (pp. 42-45) is that the earl came to London "in the vernal blossom" of his beauty—a beauty made obvious today by Van Dyck's portrait of him; that he was melancholy (as in 8); and that many of the sonnets (like 36, 49) express fears lest his "*rank and state*" may separate him from the poet, a common actor (110, 111). In addition, the rival poet of the sonnets, Daniel (p. 48), was brought up at the Pembroke seat, Wilton, and to Sh.'s friend dedicated the *Defense of Rime*, 1602. A pointed reference is made in 86, with its "affable familiar ghost," to Dr. John Dee (pp. 56 f.), whose chief patrons were the queen and the Pembrokes. "Daniel was domiciliated at Wilton, within the very lime-twigs of the Necromancer's spells. Who shall say that 'he came off safe?' " From all "these united proofs" (p. 59), which are at least weightier than those Drake presented for Southampton, Boaden was confident of having settled the question once and forever.

Scores of people for over a century have shared this confidence. Immediately C. A. BROWN (*Sh.'s Autobiographical Poems*, 1838, pp. 42-44) advanced further so-called proofs: "Not only do the initials [W. H.] belong to the name, but the title, 'Mr.' was not improperly applied to the eldest son of an Earl, there not having been, at that period, any grander title of courtesy." Another point is that the date when 1-126 were written, about 1598, fits Pembroke alone; those sonnets could apply only to a boy of seventeen or eighteen; and that boy (p. 72) became "the worthiest, the most accomplished, and perhaps the most elegantly learned nobleman of his day." Boaden's statements were also accepted by CAMPBELL (*Sh.'s Dramatic Works*, 1838 [1842 ed., p. xxvi]) as definitely proved. Then in the next year ULRICI (*Sh.'s Dramatic Art*, 1846, pp. 91 f.), announcing that Boaden had "fully . . . established his own view," became the first German scholar of importance to wear Pembroke's badge. HALLAM (*Introduction*, 1839, III, 290) more cautiously, remarked, "This hypothesis is not strictly proved, but sufficiently so, in my opinion, to demand our assent." KNIGHT (ed. 1841, pp. 95, 126 f.) thought otherwise. Unable to endorse any of the proposed identifications, he found not "the slightest allusion" in Q to Pembroke, and he balked at the idea of such a nobleman's being referred to as "Master."¹ But in 1845 HUNTER (*New Illustrations*, I, 236-240,

¹ Herbert made an early appearance as Sh.'s friend in R. F. WILLIAMS's novel, *The Secret Passion*, 1844.

II, 346-348) reaffirmed his approval of Boaden's and Bright's theory, calling the latter "an original discoverer if ever there was one," but adding that Boaden, C. A. Brown, and Burgon¹ had independently reached Bright's own conclusions. MASSON (*MS. Autobiography of Sh.*, 1846) also argued in favor of Pembroke, the most amusing part of his demonstration being (II, 55: see p. 185, above) a new interpretation of 20.7 in modernized spelling, "A man in hue, all Hughs in his controlling." In writing this line, Sh. remembered that young Herbert was "the son of the Lord President in Wales," and hence he punned on the "name *Hugh*, as a synonym for *Welchmen*."

In America HUDSON (*Lectures on Sh.*, 1848, I, 29-34) took up the Pembroke hypothesis; and so did his compatriots ALGER (*Christian Examiner*, 1862, LXXIII, 414-434) and WHITE (ed. 1865, p. 148). The latter said that it "alone is worthy of serious consideration." STAUNTON (ed. 1860, p. 759) had described it as "more plausible" than Drake's hypothesis, though he rejected each. Similarly PALGRAVE (ed. 1865, p. 240) wrote: "No other known, or plausible name but Herbert's has been suggested"; but he shied at the bare idea that the earl could have been called "Mr.," or that all the sonnets could have been "occasioned by" him. DELIUS (*Jahrbuch*, 1865, I, 22-24), for much the same reasons, rejected Brown's statement of the case. But MINTO (*Characteristics*, 1874, pp. 286 f.) waved all difficulties aside. In the third sonnet he detected a reference to Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke: "No illustrious family ever won the hearts of the poets so completely as the Sidneys. . . . As Sidney was considered the jewel of Elizabeth's Court, and his sister the paragon of her sex, so Pembroke was said to be 'the most universally beloved and esteemed of any man' of his age. This lends additional point to Shakespeare's urgency for the marriage of his friend." Minto also cited (p. 285) what seemed to him a parallel to the "Mr." address of Q: the appearance of extracts from Lord Buckhurst's *Mirror for Magistrates* poems in Allot's *England's Parnassus*, 1600, over the signatures "M. Sackuill," "M. Sackuile," and the like. Though the parallel has often since been repeated, STOPES (*Athenaeum*, March 19, 1898, p. 374) showed it to be valueless, because Sackville actually was a plain "Master" or "Mr.," not a "Lord," when he wrote the *Mirror* poems quoted by Allot, whereas Herbert was a lord from birth; and time after time LEE (as in *Life*, 1898, p. 408 n.) rephrased her explanation. Cautious agreement with the Pembroke theory as such was voiced by GÄTSCHENBERGER (*Geschichte der englischen Dichtkunst*, 2d ed., 1874, p. 51), by KATE HILLARD (*Lippincott's*, 1875, XV, 506), and by ELZE (*William Sh.* [1876], 1888, pp. 322 f. n.).

The level-headed DOWDEN (ed. 1881) reproduced the arguments known to him for all the friend-candidates, without deferring to any; but (p. 45) he directed attention to "some critics [who] have supposed that Ben Jonson alludes to Thorpe's dedication" when, dedicating his *Epigrams* to Pembroke (*Works*, 1616, p. 767) the poet remarked: "MY LORD. *While you cannot change your merit, I dare not change your title: It was that made it, and not I.*

¹ E. M. GOULBURN (*John William Burgon*, 1892, I, 46-50) prints a letter of February 11, 1835, in which BURGON tells Hunter that he has "discovered, unaided, the clue" to Sh.'s sonnets, and one of February 12 in which HUNTER refers him to Boaden's articles.

Vnder which name, J here offer to your Lo: the ripest of my studies, my Epigrammes; which, though they carry danger in the sound, doe not therefore seeke your shelter: For, when J made them, J had nothing in my conscience, to expressing of which I did need a cypher." The critics Dowden referred to were MASSEY (*Secret Drama*, 1872, Supplement, p. 35) and, perhaps, his disciple KRAUSS (*Jahrbuch*, 1881, XVI, 207). The former had commented: "Ben Jonson . . . [like Wither, for whom see p. 215, below] ostensibly alludes to Thorpe's inscription and at the same time points out *William Herbert* as the object of it. . . . [Jonson's epigram] tells us plainly enough that the Earl's title had been changed in some previous dedication. . . . Here is an answer once for all to those who have urged against my reading, that the 'Mr. W. H.' could not be William Herbert, *because* he was the Earl of Pembroke, and *because* it was not the custom of the time to address Earls as 'Masters!' . . . If my interpretation of Wither's dedication to himself be right, this of . . . Jonson's looks like a reply to it, as though it were an endeavour to saddle Thorpe with the responsibility of publishing Shakspeare's Sonnets and dedicating them to the Earl."

About this time Pembroke's star rocketed into the zenith as a result of the indefatigable talking and writing of TYLER and W. A. HARRISON. By 1884 MACKAY (see pp. 46 f., above, and p. 261, below), developing a hint from MASSEY (ed. 1866), was calling Pembroke the actual composer of the dark-woman sonnets, and the New Sh. Society was listening with enthusiasm to Tyler's paper on Pembroke and Fitton, described by its president, FURNIVALL (see p. 263, below), as "the most important contribution" yet made to the sonnet problem. Naturally SHARP (ed. 1885, p. 25) could say, with little fear of contradiction, "It is now known, almost certainly beyond disproof, that Shakespeare's friend was William Herbert." Although Tyler's insistence on identifying the dark woman as Fitton, Pembroke's mistress, eventually helped to destroy faith in his main theory, yet for some ten or fifteen years his arguments for the earl won the approval of the majority of English and American scholars, as well as of an occasional German writer like SCHAIKLE (*Sh. der Autor*, 1889, p. 36); and his facsimile edition of 1886 and his more elaborate edition of 1890 put the Southamptonites to a temporary rout. Even those not entirely convinced were likely to say with VERITY (ed. 1890, p. 401): "If we are to fix on any body in particular as the 'begetter' . . . our choice must, I think, fall on Pembroke, and not on Southampton." STOPES (*Poet-Lore*, 1890, II, 466-470, 474-476; *Jahrbuch*, 1890, XXV, 190-196, 199-201) presented objections to Pembroke's being Mr. W. H., washed her hands of Fitton, but followed Tyler in designating the earl as Sh.'s friend. DOWNING (*God in Sh.*, 1890, pp. 82 f.) can scarcely have helped the latter's cause by saying that he is equated in 1-126 "with various ideas" like beauty, truth, love, heavenly beauty, and that beauty includes the poet's "ideas of his muse, which is the inspiration of beauty, of his genius, which is his inspiration, and of himself as the possessor of that genius." Yet he failed to discourage SHINDLER (*G. M.*, 1892, CCLXXII, 72 f.), who saw "hardly even a decent show of probability" for any other claimant than Pembroke, since Tyler's book "may fairly be said to settle the question." Most of the Italian scholars sided with Pembroke, as STRAFFORELLO (*Curiosità ed amenità*, 1889, p. 163), OLIVIERI (*Sh.'s Sonetti*, 1890, p. xxi), CHIARINI (*Nuova antologia*, 1890, 3d series, XXVII, 127), and DE MARCHI (*Sh.'s Sonetti*, 1891,

pp. 62 f.); but all were content to repeat old arguments. CONRAD (*Jahrbuch*, 1895, XXXI, 321 f.), however, in needlessly vigorous language announced that if there is still an investigator who accepts the "Pembroke fable," he lacks either knowledge of what has been turned up by research or else a sufficient faculty of judgment. Such an impolite generalization had, and has, no effect. WÜLKER (*Geschichte der englischen Litteratur*, 1896, p. 292), evidently considering himself abreast of scholarship, temporarily preferred Pembroke to Southampton,¹ and announced that 1-17 were written at the request of Lady Pembroke, who wished her son to marry.

Just as BOAS (*Sh. and His Predecessors*, 1896, pp. 118-120) was writing that Pembroke is the only candidate "supported by tangible evidence" (of which he gave the scantiest examples), GOLLANCZ (ed. 1896, pp. xiii-xvi) was confessing inability to go with the crowd in preferring him to Southampton. The confession must have seemed perverse, quixotic, because in his *D. N. B.* sketches of Fitton, 1889, Lady Pembroke, 1891, and Herbert, 1891, LEE had canonized the last as the friend. The thousands of readers who consulted this great work, in the somewhat naive assurance of finding nothing but unembellished facts, were informed that Sh. "doubtless refers" to Mary Sidney Herbert in 3, that Thorpe's dedication of Q "is addressed to Pembroke, disguised under the initials of his family name—William Herbert," and that Sh.'s "young friend was doubtless Pembroke himself, and 'the dark lady' in all probability was Pembroke's mistress, Mary Fitton. Nothing in the sonnets directly contradicts the identification of W. H. . . . with William Herbert, and many minute internal details confirm it." With the *D. N. B.* on their side, the Pembrokists could sit tight; the dispute was apparently ended.

It was, accordingly, a terrible blow to Tyler and his earnest men all, a stab in the back from a trusted ally, when in the volume containing Sh.'s life, 1897, without a word to hint at his reasons for so abrupt a shift of opinion, LEE told thousands of other readers: "There is no evidence that he [Pembroke] was in his youth acquainted with the poet, or at any time closely associated with him." The Pembroke theory is one of several that "rest on wholly erroneous premisses." The sonnets contain "the plain avowal" that the man addressed is the poet's patron, and Sh. "is not known to have formally acknowledged any literary patron except Southampton." The article on Henry Wriothesley, 1900, revealed only that "Southampton doubtless inspired Shakespeare with genuine personal affection," and that the theory of his being the friend "is powerfully supported by internal evidence"—a statement open to grave doubt when the evidence set forth has been pondered. The biographical breezes now began to veer. CHAMBERS (*Academy*, 1897, LII, 98) at once spoke of "the rapidly thinning ranks" of the Pembrokists, and A. HALL (the same, p. 118) crowed, "Herbert is quite out of the running."

In an attempt to undo the damage wrought by Lee, WILLIAM ARCHER published a long essay on "The Case against Southampton" (*Fortnightly*, 1897, LXVIII, 817-834). Little of importance for or against Pembroke or Southampton has been added since Archer summarized the evidence and since Lee in the *D. N. B.* argued first for the one, then for the other. Archer begins

¹ See p. 191, above.

(p. 818) by stressing Boaden's idea that the earl had, as the first folio dedication tells, "prosequuted" Sh. with definite help and favor. Next (pp. 818-824), he declares that the dates of the sonnets, 1598-1601, can fit only Herbert, not Wriothesley. Even 1-17 cannot be earlier than 1598, and their resemblance to passages in *Venus* means only that "similar situations beget similar expressions"; in trying to direct young Herbert's thoughts toward marriage, the poet naturally drew on themes he had earlier used. The references to Sh.'s inexperienced pen, his ignorance, are nothing but "exaggerated humility"; those to his own age are not to be taken too literally, but they point to a date when he "could, without *too* much poetical licence, describe himself" thus to one considerably his junior. The youth of the friend is everywhere emphasized, as in 41, 54, 95, 96, 108, 126. Accordingly, the younger a candidate for the friend's place is, the better his chances of attaining that honor. Southampton was nine and a half years younger than Sh., Pembroke sixteen. The dates 1594-1598, given to the sonnets by partisans of the former, make at first a poet aged thirty address his verses to a man of twenty-one and at last a poet aged thirty-four describe himself to a "sweet boy" of twenty-five as of "tand antiquitie." In Archer's dating, 1598-1601, Sh., aged thirty-four to thirty-seven, writes to Herbert, aged eighteen to twenty-one. As for the alleged difficulty (p. 834) of the earl's being called "Mr.," Thorpe could not possibly have inscribed the sonnets to "Lord," because they deal plainly with a discreditable episode in his early life; or perhaps Thorpe did not know who W. H. was.¹ Archer's arguments pivot on a late date for the sonnets. His favorable inclination towards Fitton as the dark woman was generally regarded as weakening them.

Of course LEE had a perfect right to move abruptly from one side to another (his doing so speaks well for his open-mindedness); though, in view of the flat contradiction between the 1889 (Fitton) and 1891 (Herbert) volumes and the 1897 (Sh.) and 1900 (Wriothesley) volumes of the *D. N. B.*, it might have been fairer to students, and more sporting, if he had mentioned his change of creed. Nobody is so zealous as a recent convert from an old to a new religion, and in his *Life* of 1898 and in two long magazine articles of the same year (*Fortnightly*, LXIX, 210-223, a direct reply to Archer; *Cornhill*, n. s., IV, 482-495), LEE assailed the Pembrokists and tried to strengthen the Southamptonites, never once referring to his own former views. The "corner-stone" of the Pembroke theory, Lee informed Archer (LXIX, 211-213), is the belief that he is the Mr. W. H. of the dedication. Lee then attempted to remove the stone by showing how from the very hour of his birth that son of an earl was called by his courtesy title, Lord Herbert, and how no Elizabethan would have dared to refer to him as "Mr." for fear of Star Chamber penalties for "the offence of defamation." John Healey, dedicating to Pembroke his translation of the *Discovery of a New World*, 1609, and Thorpe, dedicating to Pembroke the same Healey's translations of the *City of God*, 1610, and of Epictetus, Cebes, and Theophrastus, 1616, displayed the earl's titles at length and used the most obse-

¹ TYLER (*Academy*, 1897, LII, 78 f.; see also 1890, XXXVII, 409) had urged that the "Mr." "was adopted (quite possibly at Shakespeare's suggestion) as furnishing at least some slight disguise" for Pembroke.

quious language.¹ Again, in the dedication of the first folio to Pembroke and his brother Philip, the actors Heming and Condell humbly remark, "we haue iustly obserued, no man to come neere your L. L. but vvith a kind of religious addresse." Having thus disposed of Mr. W. H. as inconceivably Pembroke, Lee maintained (pp. 214 f.) that the whole theory has collapsed, and that only one other point remains in its favor: the dedication of the folio. But, he asserts in somewhat unguarded language, "to the two Earls in partnership nearly every work of any literary pretension was dedicated at the period." William Herbert was, further, "Lord Chamberlain in 1623, and exercised supreme authority in theatrical affairs." Hence the actor-editors naturally sought his patronage. The statement that both earls "prosequuted," or favored, Sh. during his life means only that they "shared the enthusiastic esteem which James I. and all the noblemen of his Court extended to Shakespeare and his plays." The phrase "your seruant *Shakespeare*" makes it plain that the earls favored Sh. only "in the capacity of 'King's servant' or player." Then, forgetting that in the *D. N. B.*, 1891, he had called Pembroke "handsome and accomplished," Lee now denied that "the loveliness" stressed in Sh.'s verses was "ever set to Pembroke's account." As for the alleged play on the friend's name as Will in 134-136 and 143, that (pp. 217-223) is a mistake: in them reference is made to only one Will, Sh. himself, and to the noun *will*, meaning sensual indulgence or lust.² Finally (p. 223), the one "distinctive fact" told in the sonnets about the friend is that he was Sh.'s literary patron. This "fact" turns up in 26, 38, 69, 79, 80, 82-86. If it actually were a fact, Pembroke, who was twenty in 1600, by which time he had scarcely begun to patronize writers, would certainly be less a favorite than Southampton, who at twenty and twenty-one in 1593 and 1594 had received Sh.'s homage in *Venus and Lucrece*.

Noticeably LEE at first expended more effort in attempting to demolish Pembroke's claims than in trying to build any very substantial foundation for Southampton's. His arguments for the latter—repeated with increasing conviction, whenever opportunity offered, to the end of his life—leave many scholars entirely unimpressed. In particular, his comments on Pembroke's looks redoubled in vigor. ANTHONY WOOD, some time after the earl's death, wrote (*Fasti*, 1815, part I, col. 313), "His person was rather majestic than elegant, and his presence, whether quiet or in motion, was full of stately gravity." With that passage in mind TYLER (ed. 1890, p. 70) had conceded that extant portraits scarcely justify Sh.'s praise of his friend's beauty, though all were painted when the earl was forty or more. But in November, 1891 (*Critic*, 1891, n. s., XVI, 334 f.), he and FURNIVALL, after studying the Daniel Mytens portrait of the earl, joyfully decided that the latter had a "delicately-modelled

¹ Here Lee was anticipated by W. C. HAZLITT, who had reprinted the 1616 dedication in his *Prefaces*, 1874, pp. 228 f., insisting (p. 226) that Mr. W. H. could not be Pembroke.

² Lee is cut and dried in comparison to SARRAZIN (*William Sh.'s Lehrjahre*, 1897, p. 158), who "as in a palimpsest" reads "the original text," so that 143.13 f. end in *Hen*, "an abbreviation for Henry, less commonly used than Harry or Hal," and *pen*.

and woman-like face," and that "its evidence [was] conclusive in favor of the delicate girlishness of young Herbert."¹ LEE's ideas of art (*Life*, 1898, pp. 413 f.) were different. Scrutinizing the same pictures, he decided that they "seem to confute the suggestion that he was reckoned handsome at any time of life." HENRY BROWN (*Sonnets of Sh.*, 1870, pp. 183 f.) had observed that FRANCIS DAVISON, dedicating the *Poetical Rhapsody*, 1602, to Pembroke, begins by saying:

Great Earle, whose high and noble minde, is higher
And nobler, then thy noble high Degree:
Whose outward shape, though it most louely bee,
Doth in faire Robes a fairer Soule attier. . . .

This highly inconvenient testimony Lee waved aside with the statement (p. 413) that Davison "makes a cautiously qualified reference to the attractiveness of his person." All readers today will, I imagine, agree with BEECHING (ed. 1904, pp. xxxviii f.) that Davison, "being a gentleman, was less likely than a literary hack to say the thing that was not," that since "the occasion did not call for any reference to the Earl's personal appearance, Davison's statement must be received with attention," and that such testimony to the earl's loveliness in 1602 when he was twenty-two, far from being cautiously qualified, is "very strong." Let us grant, then, Pembroke's good looks and general attractiveness, even if STOPES (*Athenaeum*, March 19, 1898, p. 374) did solemnly point out that he could not have had a sweet breath "like a rose" (she cites 54.11)—because he "greatly enjoyed tobacco." Why has not some Pembrokist seen in this distressing circumstance the reason that Sh. never once refers to tobacco?

LEE (*Life*, 1898, p. 406 n.) expressed the pious hope that "the Pembroke theory, whose adherents have dwindled of late, will henceforth be relegated . . . to the category of popular delusions." He was doomed to disappointment. The Tyler-Archer arguments were practically endorsed by WYNDHAM (ed. 1898, pp. cviii, 250), favorably reviewed by THOMAS NEAL (*Mazzocco*, December 19, 1897, p. 3), and unreservedly accepted by AUGUST DÖRING (*Hamlet*, 1898, pp. 41-54). With great imagination Döring produces "facts" proving Herbert not only the friend of the sonnets but also Hamlet. For example: in 1599, when the friendship was serene, the young lord was nineteen and beautiful; he was interested in the theater, friendly with the actors. Hamlet has the same characteristics: he was acquainted with the actors before they were forced to go on tours to the provinces and Elsinore, and was especially friendly with the first player. The discussion in *Hamlet*, II.ii. 343-385, corresponds to the travel sonnets (as 27, 28, 44, 45, 48), which were composed during absences of Sh. and his troupe from London. After enumerating various other analogies of the same sort, Döring tells us that the Fitton affair brought about a coolness between friend and poet. By 1604 they were hope-

¹ By 1897 (*Theatre*, XXX, 298) FURNIVALL had changed his mind: the portrait then showed that Pembroke "must have been 'swarthy,' with black hair." NICHOLSON (*Athenaeum*, July 11, 1891, pp. 74 f.) had earlier emphasized these details, which eliminate Pembroke as the "fair and red and white gentleman" of the sonnets.

lessly estranged, for in the *Hamlet* version of this year the hero's age has been altered. BRANDES, too (*William Sh.*, 1898, I, 316-326), asserted that the Pembroke theory is held "by the best critics," having received "its final confirmation" in Tyler's edition; and he developed it, particularly as regards the dark woman Fitton, into what reads more like a novel than serious criticism. Just about as unimpressive evidence was that noticed by "SYLVANUS URBAN" (*G. M.*, 1898, CCLXXXV, 102 f.): the portrait of Pembroke with its bogus letter containing lines from 81 (see the notes). He concluded that the handwriting "is not later than the close of the last century," and hence that somebody (whoever he was) identified W. H. with Pembroke before 1800. What significance one may attach to this contribution (except as a possible "discovery" antedating Bright's and Boaden's) is not clear. A. W. WARD (*History*, 1899, II, 26, 31 f.) maintained that the identification of Mr. W. H. with Pembroke has "a probability approaching very near to certainty." In striking contrast, W. C. HAZLITT (*Shakespear*, 1902, p. 188; 1912, p. 222) dismissed it as "an excessively absurd one." Absurd or not, ROLFE (*Life*, 1904, pp. 355-361, 365) gave it support; while CREIGHTON (*Sh.'s Story*, 1904) provided embellishments. For example (p. 2), 19 is "a witty exercise upon the Pembroke heraldry," and the "man in hew" of 20 is "a punning clue to the identity of Lord Herbert, one of whose courtesy titles was Lord Fitzhew,"¹ while the frequent mention of *Rose* is caused by another of his titles, Lord Ros of Kendal.² Arguments, or assertions, on a par with Creighton's were produced by HESSEN (*Leben Sh.'s*, 1904, pp. 209-211); as that Pembroke lived near the theaters in London; that his parents wished him to marry young; and that he came to London in 1598 and was banned from it in 1601—a three-year interval almost conclusively proving him the hero of 104 and hence of 18-144 (*sic*).

Perhaps the ablest opponent of Lee, though not an adherent of Pembroke, was Beeching. On various occasions (as in the *Cornhill*, 1898, n. s., IV, 489) LEE insisted that in a "dozen or more" sonnets (he names 26, 32, 38, 69, 78-86) Sh. unmistakably calls his beautiful young friend his literary patron. But BEECHING (ed. 1904, pp. xx f.) retorted: "Surely there is all the difference in the world between the subject and argument of a book and its patron! But even supposing them to coincide, how small a proportion do these so-called 'dedicatory' sonnets bear to the whole number, and how difficult it is to conceive of many of the remainder as written by a literary *protégé* to his patron! For they are not all flattering to their subject. . . . Could an Elizabethan patron have been told that he was 'left the prey of every vulgar thief'? (48). . . . The 'patron' theory fails because it obliges adherents to deny that all the first group of sonnets are addressed to the same person."³ Southamptonites, of

¹ An idea broached earlier by C. E. BROWNE (*N. & Q.*, March 13, 1880, p. 210). WALSH (ed. 1908, p. 17) jestingly found further support for Pembroke in *Hews* by explaining it as a combination of "*He[r]bert*." and "*W[illiam]. S[h]*."

² *Rose* and *hew* are explained exactly in Creighton's manner by FLATTER (*Sh.'s Sonette*, 1934, p. 12).

³ H. MUTSCHMANN (*Beiblatt*, 1916, XXVII, 268) likewise calls it "a weak hypothesis" to say that the poems are "addressed to a noble friend who is identical with the 'patron' of the narrative poems."

course, brush aside these objections—especially the last sentence—as immaterial and irrelevant; but they experience more difficulty in refuting Beeching's comments (pp. xxxvii, 125) on the Will sonnets. He recognizes the poet and two other men named Will in 135.1-4, agreeing with DOWDEN (ed. 1881, pp. 290 f.) that they are perhaps the lady's husband and certainly the poet's friend; "and that there are more Wills than one concerned in the matter is made more evident still" by passages like lines 7 f. and 13 f. of the same sonnet.

HADOW (ed. 1907), HARRIS (*Man Sh.*, 1909), and HENRY BROWN (*Sh.'s Patrons*, 1912, pp. 49-84) write as if Herbert's claim had never been challenged. "It is known," says the first (p. ix), with no reference to the source of such knowledge, "that during the closing years of the sixteenth century he [Sh.] was on terms of friendship with the young . . . Earl of Pembroke. . . . It is believed that at the same time he was acquainted with . . . Mary Fitton who, before 1600, became Herbert's mistress." Until Tyler wrote, Harris affirms (p. 201), "the sonnets lay in the dim light of guess-work," and he then proceeds (pp. 203-211) to focus a searchlight on the plays as a continuation of the Herbert-Fitton-Sh. triangle.

STOPES in 1908 (*Sh.'s Environment*, 1914, pp. 142 f.)¹ gave her mature objections to Pembroke, elucidating her apostasy. In brief, as he first came to London in 1598 (her date is about three years off), his backers must believe that Sh. "instantly was introduced to him, immediately began to write quatorzains, or disingenuously pretended to do so for the *first time*." Evidently she had forgotten that Sh. traveled here and there, with or without his coat, on a dull horse or on foot, and that there is no earthly reason why he could not have met Herbert outside London long before 1598. But she goes on, forgetting also the Elizabethan conventions of humility, to insist that in 1598 the poet could not have spoken of his pupil pen, his rude ignorance, since he had already composed his poems, *Romeo and Juliet*, and "many other plays." Besides (here is a real literalist), "Herbert was *not* the sole hope of his great house," for he had a father and a brother; "he was *not* a *fair* youth, but exceptionally dark; he wore no long locks"; and, to clinch it all, because "his chief comfort was in the use of *tobacco*," his breath was bad. This last "fact" had bothered her for at least ten years (see p. 202, above); though if it is true (and why should Elizabethans have had better breath than modern smokers?), the more reason why Sh. should have concealed it by flattery. BERNARD SHAW, who in 1884 (*N. Sh. S. T.*, 1880-1886, p. 96*) had maintained on the evidence of an engraving "from the portrait said to be by Mytens" that Pembroke was "a remarkably handsome man," apparently took such comments as Stopes's with his customary levity. In 1910 (*Nation*, VIII, 543) he declared his old preference for the Pembroke theory, and explained away the "Mr." on the ground that Pembroke "could hardly have allowed himself to be published to all the world as the wicked earl in the little drama of the faithful poet, the wanton lady, and the false friend."

PORTER (*New York Nation*, 1912, XCV, 532 f.; compare also 1913, XCVI, 80) soon came forward with evidence designed to eliminate the bad-breathed earl. From ARTHUR COLLINS's *Letters and Memorials*, 1746 (II, 43), she quotes,

¹ Much of this material is reprinted from her 1904 edition, pp. xviii-xx.

none too accurately, Rowland Whyte's letter of April 19, 1597, to Sir Robert Sidney, "My Lord *Harbart* hath, with much a doe, brought his Father to consent that he may liue at *London*, yet not before the next Springe"; but she thinks the report an error, for just eight days later, April 27 (II, 46), Whyte is writing, "I heare that . . . my Lord *Harbart* the next Spring shall come to *Leiden*." Porter then remarks (without noticing TYLER's own comments [ed. 1890, p. 44 n.] on *Leiden*) that Sh. could not, as the Pembrokeists maintain, have met the young lord during 1598, since he was in Leyden during most of 1598 and till about August 4, 1599—too late for him to be the hero of the sonnets, which were referred to by Meres in 1598 and two of which (138, 144) were published in the *P. P.* of 1599. Her words cannot be taken seriously. In the first place Whyte's April 19 letter actually reads (see C. L. KINGSFORD, *Report on the Manuscripts of Lord de L'Isle & Dudley*, 1934, II, 268) "in London, but not before next summer"; in the second, an earlier letter of October 25, 1595 (the same, II, 177), heretofore neglected by Pembroke's supporters, tells that "my lord Harbert . . . [is] gonne to the Court"—at which time, one presumes, Sh. could have met him; and in the third, Herbert was not out of England in 1598–1599.

Just at this time FRANCES B. YOUNG (*Mary Sidney*, 1912, pp. 197 f.) wrote of "the passing, in more modern scholarship, of this identification" of Pembroke as the friend. A large volume could be compiled about Shakespearean scholars who assume that everybody believes what they themselves believe. But scholarship much more modern than Young's has refused to pass by Pembroke. J. MEISSNER (*Jung-Sh.*, 1914, pp. 93 f.), to be sure, did pass, because he supposed the earlier sonnets to date from 1590–1593, at which time "the beautiful countess would probably have resented being treated as a matron"—though what bearing her probable resentment can have on the friend's identity is not entirely clear to me. SARRAZIN's rejection of Pembroke (*Internationale Monatsschrift*, 1914, VIII, 1076 f.) was based upon his belief that Sh. wrote the lyrics during 1593–1596, in which years, he says wrongly, Pembroke was never in London.

In 1916 APPLETON MORGAN (*Catholic World*, CIII, 12) restated the old notion (see pp. 197 f., above) that Jonson had "revealed" Mr. W. H. as Pembroke; for, in dedicating his *Epigrams* to the nobleman, he "plainly says, 'I dare not change your Lordship's title, since there is nothing in the epigrams in expressing which it is necessary to employ a cipher,' plainly referring to the dedication" of Q. Morgan, an indefatigable anti-Stratfordian (despite his forty-years' presidency of the New York Sh. Society) and a voluminous author, had considerable influence in America. Hence his belated admission (the same, 1918, CVII, 235) of having recanted "my entire Baconian creed" to adopt Tyler's Pembroke theory cannot be lightly dismissed.

POOLER (ed. 1918, p. xxvii) characterized "Lord Herbert's supposed intimacy with Shakespeare" as a guess "unproved" like Southampton's supposed intimacy. It rests purely on the first folio statement that Herbert "favoured Shakespeare and took pleasure in his plays," a statement including also his brother Philip; "that Pembroke liked Shakespeare's plays and employed his Company to amuse his guests does not prove that they were personal friends." With this restrained judgment may be compared that of TUCKER (ed. 1924,

p. xlviii: "While admitting that Mr W. H. may after all have been some other person lost to records, we can do no less than admit that the strongest, and withal a highly plausible, case has been made out for William Herbert. But . . . it is quite possible, and highly probable, that no inconsiderable number of the sonnets were understood, even by Thorpe, to be addressed to other recipients, and among these may have been Southampton." "On the whole it would certainly appear," Tucker (p. 1) concludes, "that the balance of evidence is greatly in favour of Herbert," but his final verdict is that no theory of the friend's identity is provable. COWLING (*Preface*, 1925, pp. 77 f.) also thought Pembroke a more probable candidate, whereas THURSTON (*Month*, 1930, CLVI, 427) declared, "So far as my researches enable me to judge, this solution has now been completely abandoned." One hopes that these researches were promptly extended to cover Chambers's new book.

Once a Pembrokist, then (see *Academy*, 1897, LII, 98) an outspoken critic of "the specious structure of Mr. Tyler's theory," an "unsubstantial pageant faded into nothingness," in 1930 CHAMBERS (*William Sh.*, I, 566 f.) partially recanted. He now thinks that Tyler and others mishandled Herbert's case, particularly in their obsession for Mary Fitton, which perforce made them date the majority of the sonnets 1598-1601 and refer the opening group to an abortive marriage arrangement between Herbert and Lady Bridget Vere in 1597. Chambers makes some interesting new points: that if the sonnets were written in 1593-1596 Herbert, aged thirteen to sixteen, "was more naturally to be called a 'boy' at that time than Southampton"; that when Herbert was barely fifteen, an effort was made to betroth him to Sir George Carey's daughter—an effort nullified, Rowland Whyte writes on November 22, 1595 (COLLINS, *Letters and Memorials*, 1746, I, 363), by Herbert's "not liking" the idea. The resemblance here to the boy of 1-17 looks significant. Chambers calls attention to various other matters, as the dedication of the 1623 folio to the Pembrokes, while Southampton was alive, and concludes: "I think that, if we are to look in the ranks of the higher nobility, it is Herbert, rather than Southampton, who affords the most plausible identification for Shakespeare's friend. I am not clear that the conditions might not be satisfied by some young man of good birth and breeding, but of less degree than an earl. But I have no candidate to propose."

GREGOR (*Shakespeare*, 1935, pp. 547 f.) likewise votes for Pembroke, whom, according to C. CLARK (*Sh. and Psychology*, 1936, p. 140), "modern views more generally favour." KITTREDGE (ed. 1936, p. 1491), on the other hand, says that "Southampton is the favourite claimant," but continues: "His title is no stronger than Pembroke's, perhaps not so strong." HOTSON (*I, William Sh.* 1937, pp. 71-96) dissents. He furnishes a detailed narrative of the "long-lived enmity" between Sir Henry Berkeley, stepfather of Sh.'s friend Thomas Russell, and the second Earl of Pembroke. But it is not easy to see why quarrels between the stepfather of the man who was an overseer of Sh.'s will and the father of the alleged friend of the sonnets make it "more unlikely than ever" that the last was Lord Pembroke's son William. SPENCER (*Art and Life*, 1940, p. 31), at any rate, thinks this William "a more plausible guess" than Henry Wriothesley, and such is the opinion of the present writer.

Like his rival, Pembroke has won the allegiance of many writers who con-

sider "Sh." a *nom de plume*. Briefly to illustrate, CONSTANCE M. POTT (*Did Francis Bacon*, etc., 2d ed., 1893 [part I], p. 8; part II, p. 45)¹ says that Q was dedicated to "William Herbert, afterwards [*sic*] Earl of Pembroke, Francis Bacon's life-long friend"; while PEMBERTON (*Sh. and Sir Walter Raleigh*, 1914, pp. 82-84, 93) regards him as the friend of the poet "Sh." or Raleigh, and BLEIBTREU (*Lösung der Sh.-Frage*, 1907, p. 91) of "Sh." or the Earl of Rutland. As a lengthier illustration from the last school consider LANDAU (*Sh.-Mysterium*, 1930, pp. 123 f.): "The role of the greatest poet's [Rutland's] friend fell automatically to . . . [William Herbert], who was the nephew of the celebrated Ph. Sidney, the son of a gifted poetess, the pupil of the poet Daniel, and a well-known art connoisseur and patron. Handsome and charming, the author of many amorous adventures, at the same time his contemporaries describe him as a man of equable and noble character and of strong purpose, which might explain Shakespeare's [Rutland's] great affection for him." In Rutland's case the Earl of Pembroke would suit better than the Earl of Southampton as the "begetter" of the sonnets, since the former was four years younger than Rutland. The poet's oft-repeated "my boy," "my sweet boy," would then refer to this difference in age, whereas Southampton was three years older than Rutland. If scholars are perturbed to think that a noble earl like Pembroke is called "Mr. W. H.," they should realize that the omission of his title would have seemed reasonable to Rutland; for "it is clear that not only the name of the poet himself but also that of the friend was to be protected from the curiosity of the populace."

Passing reference should be made, also, to the numerous theorists who, for good impartial measure, make place in Q for both Pembroke and Southampton. I have mentioned elsewhere (pp. 167 f., 175, above)² CHASLES's queer idea that W. H., or Pembroke, dedicated Q to Southampton, and CORNEY's modification of it, as well as MASSEY's dramatic hypothesis—that both earls appear, equipped with their lady-loves Vernon and Rich—which was welcomed by the Swiss translator KRAUSS. The last was in part adopted also by MACKAY in 1884 (see p. 92, above). SANFELICE (*Sh.'s 154 sonetti*, 1898, pp. 37-39, 44; *Rivista d'Italia*, 1898, III, 309, 316 f.) described Q as a sort of joint publication by Sh., Herbert, and Thorpe. W. H. is Herbert, but the man for whom Sh. wishes eternity is Southampton. For reasons not worth retailing here, Sanfelice decides that Southampton is the friend written about in 1-126 and Pembroke in 127-152. Much the same notion was for a time held by FORT (see p. 246, below). Equally improbable is ACHESON's conjecture (*Sh. and the Rival Poet*, 1903, pp. 4 f.) that Southampton is the friend but Pembroke is Thorpe's Mr. W. H., and that Q was published because of the latter's "influence and with his cognizance." HESSEN (*Leben Sh.'s*, 1904, pp. 208 f.) leaned to the side of Herbert, while thinking Southampton the boy of 1-17. M. M. A. SCHRÖER (*Grundzüge und Haupttypen*, 2d ed., 1914, II, 11) asserted flatly that the sonnets are probably based upon Sh.'s personal relations to Southampton "if not to . . . Pembroke and his dark mistress, Mrs. Fitton." BAB's remarks (*Shakespeare*, 1925, pp. 206 f.) cautiously reflect Hessen's: 1-17

¹ "Reprint from the Editions of 1884 & 1885."

² See also BEGLEY and CONWAY, pp. 164, 178, above.

may well be addressed to Southampton, but this possibility does not eliminate Pembroke as a candidate for friend and begetter. ELISE DECKNER (*Beiblatt*, 1925, XXXVI, 371), a belated Sanfelice or Acheson, queried: "Could not Southampton and Pembroke together have supervised the publication of the sonnets? Or, better still: could not Pembroke . . . in admiration of his protégé [Sh.] have influenced the older patron and friend of Shakespeare to publish them?" FLATTER in 1934 (*Sh.'s Sonette*, pp. 12 f.) wrote that not all the sonnets in the so-called first series (1-126) are addressed to a man; but that of those explicitly so addressed, "at least a part," including 1, 20, and 67 (as well as apparently 135 and 136 in the second series), are concerned with Pembroke, the remainder probably with Southampton. YOUNG (*Sonnets of Sh.*, 1937, pp. 101-105) presented his notion that 110, 117, 118 deal with Sh.'s second patron, Pembroke, whom he had sought out while Southampton was imprisoned for participation in the Essex rebellion. Finally, in 1941 FRAYNE WILLIAMS (*Mr. Sh.*, p. 223) let California sunshine illuminate Q and dispel the high fog of earlier speculation: "One leading patron was William Herbert and the other Henry Wriothesley. Here is no cryptogram, but it is quite evident that the two initials [W. H.] would cover a dedication to both patrons, one reading, as usual, left to right; and the other H. W. reading from right to left."¹

The world of Southampton-Pembroke theorizing is now all before the reader, where to choose his place of rest. Let us hope that providence will act as his guide; for, as the foregoing pages have made evident, any attempt to give a final verdict in the case of Pembroke versus Southampton is useless and supererogatory. Backers of the one stop their ears to words uttered by backers of the other; and, counting no old thing old, they must each day say o'er the very same thing. It can do no harm, however, to emphasize the statement that the Pembrokists have mismanaged and weakened their campaign by basing it, first, on Mr. W. H.'s identity with the friend of the sonnets; second, on Mary Fitton as the dark woman; and, third, on 1598-1601 as the date of composition. Of course Mr. W. H. almost inevitably suggests William Herbert's initials; an affirmation that he is Herbert may help the Pembrokists' arguments, but a denial does them no harm. Perhaps it would have been wiser to dismiss Mr. W. H. as a friend of the publisher's, thus avoiding the endless, profitless, and non-significant discussion about whether an earl could be called "Master." At any rate, it is just as easy to argue for Pembroke, while refusing to equate him with Mr. W. H., as to argue under the same conditions for Southampton. STOPES long ago (*Poet-Lore*, 1890, II, 460-480; *Jahrbuch*, 1890, XXV, 185-204) did so without embarrassment. Furthermore, if Mr. W. H. "procured" the manuscript of the sonnets, if he was the (highly improbable) William Hall of LEE's hypothesis, Herbert can be fitted into the situation as well as Wriothesley.

Again, TYLER's insistence upon Fitton as the dark woman drove many people to the other side of the debate. That frail lady long ago practically

¹ PHILIP WAGNER (*Beiblatt*, 1897, VIII, 228) had earlier surpassed all this by saying that Pembroke and Southampton were brothers.

disappeared from critical and scholarly consideration, thereby helping, not injuring, the status of Pembroke. It was difficult enough for the latter's partisans to show any likelihood that a common actor-poet was on terms of warm affection with the rich and haughty lord, without increasing the difficulty by trying to prove him the lover of the nobleman's mistress, a maid of honor at the royal court. In affairs with women Pembroke, however, would not have minded stooping to conquer; LEE in the current *D. N. B.*, quoting CLARENDON's *History of the Rebellion*, 1702 (ed. W. D. Macray, 1888, I, 72), says that "all his life he was 'immoderately given up to women'"; and if the triangle plot *must* be interpreted literally, Mrs. Field, the Janus-faced Mrs. Davenant, Lucy Negro, or some other will-of-the-wisp dark woman would fit the Pembroke hypothesis as well, or as badly, as the Southampton.

Nor are the dates 1598-1601 essential to the former. For all their frantic investigations, TYLER and W. A. HARRISON were unable to place Herbert in London before 1598, and even that date was sometimes challenged as too early. Sh., however, is generally supposed to have written plays for the actors known as Pembroke's Men, who (CHAMBERS, *William Sh.*, 1930, I, 327) "emerge late in 1592, and were broken by September 1593," the Pembroke in question being the father of our hero; and, accordingly, as Chambers (pp. 68 f.) observes, "he may already have been in touch with the Herberts [before 1593]," since "it is reasonable to assume that the services of players to the lords of their companies were not merely nominal."¹ Even in 1592 or 1593 Sh. could properly (if asked to do so) have addressed his "procreation" sonnets to young Herbert. The Earl of Surrey wrote a sonnet to "his loue Geraldine," or Elizabeth Fitzgerald, who was nine; and, according to LEE's *D. N. B.* sketch, when Surrey was about thirteen Anne Boleyn urged Henry VIII to affiance him to Princess Mary. Actually at the age of fourteen or fifteen² he was married to Lady Frances Vere. LEE also observes that Pembroke's younger brother, Philip Herbert "was reported to be the suitor for the hand of Mary Herbert" in April, 1597, when he was not quite thirteen. The Elizabethans arranged marriages for their sons and daughters at ages that today seem scandalously early, and there was every reason why in 1592 or 1593 the Pembrokes should have been trying to secure a suitable bride for their heir.

In any case, as I have shown, young William Herbert was at court on October 25, 1595, and he remained in London at least till November 22 (C. L. KINGSFORD, *Report on the Manuscripts of Lord de L'Isle & Dudley*, 1934, II,

¹ In August, 1865, the mistress of Wilton House informed WILLIAM CORY (*Extracts*, ed. F. W. Cornish, 1897, p. 168) that she had "a letter, never printed, from Lady [Mary Sidney] Pembroke to her son, telling him to bring James I from Salisbury to see *As You Like It*; 'we have the man Shakespeare with us.'" Both its authenticity and its existence have been challenged.

² EDMOND BAPST (*Deux gentilshommes-poètes*, 1891, pp. 153, 178 f.) places his birth in January or February, 1518, his marriage shortly after February, 1532. F. M. PADELFORD (*Poems of . . . Surrey*, 1928, pp. 4, 193) says he "was probably born in 1517," but refers only to Bapst. EDWIN CASADY (*P. M. L. A.*, 1936, LI, 627) claims to have demonstrated that 1517 is the correct date.

177, 188 [see also 194]). In October the respective families were attempting to arrange a marriage between him and Elizabeth Carey, but his "not liking" brought their efforts to an end, to the disgruntlement of Sir George Carey. The "procreation sonnets," if written before the close of 1595, would seem especially applicable to Herbert's age and actions; while for Sh. to address a fifteen-year-old lord as "sweet boy" and to urge him to follow his family's wishes by marrying is surely less abnormal than for him to apply such a term and to give such advice in 1594 to Southampton, who was twenty-one. Mary Sidney, Lady Pembroke, herself a poet of note, the sister of a world-famous poet, and a generous patron of poets, could naturally have called upon Sh. to help convert her wayward son with his pen; whereas there is no evidence that Lady Southampton (she married Sir Thomas Heneage in May, 1594) had any interest in verse or its writers, and nothing except his abortive engagement to Lady Elizabeth Vere in 1594 to show that Southampton objected to marrying.¹

Young Herbert, on the contrary, badly needed the advice given in 1-17. After he had refused to wed Elizabeth Carey in 1595, his parents tried in 1597 to make a match for him with Bridget Vere, daughter of the Earl of Oxford; but it, too, came to nothing. Once again, this time in September, 1598 (*Calendar of State Papers, Domestic . . . , 1598-1601*, 1869 p. 95; TYLER, ed. 1890, p. 50 n.), there was "speech of a match between . . . Lord Herbert, and Lady Hatton," a woman much older than he, whereas the other proposed brides were younger. Evidently the Pembroke family were desperately eager to have their young heir irrevocably fitted with the matrimonial yoke. On September 12 and 20, 1599 (KINGSFORD, II, 390, 392; TYLER, p. 52), the niece of the Earl of Nottingham, so Rowland Whyte tells, was proposed as a wife for Herbert, and her uncle approved the match; but almost a year later, August 16, 1600 (KINGSFORD, II, 477 f.), Whyte was saying that he now heard little talk of the Nottingham match, and was adding the significant remark that he saw no "disposition in this gallant young lord to marry." That Herbert none loved chastely was "most eident" (far more evident than was true of Southampton); and yet he was not what Groth (see pp. 237 f., below) called an "unnatural hater of women." Though at twenty he had at least four times successfully evaded the bonds of matrimony, he now became the acknowledged lover of Mary Fitton, who in 1601 bore him a son. The scandalized queen had the guilty pair examined; Pembroke admitted his paternity, but 'utterly renounced all marriage'—and was imprisoned. Released shortly afterwards, he remained a bachelor to the age, unusual for the time, of twenty-four and a half years, until, on November 4, 1604, he succumbed to the charms—or the wealth—of Mary Talbot, daughter of the Earl of Shrewsbury.

In many other respects, too, Pembroke is a more fitting candidate than Southampton. To judge from the numerous letters detailing his whereabouts,

¹ If Lady Pembroke did ask for Sh.'s aid, that would help explain why in 3 the boy's mother and not his father is referred to—although in the current *D. N. B.* LEE calls this an "exploded theory." Born in October, 1561, and celebrated (see FRANCES B. YOUNG, *Mary Sidney* 1912, pp. 119-121) for her beauty, in 1595 she was about thirty-five, an age at which she was certainly past "the louely Aprill of her prime."

he was not out of England during the years usually assigned to the composition of the sonnets, 1590-1601. He took no part in military or naval expeditions like his rival. Whyte notes (KINGSFORD, II, 384, 390, 418; COLLINS, *Letters and Memorials*, 1746, II, 144) on August 18, 1599, that "Lord Herbert has been 'swagring' among the men of war at London"; on September 12, that "Lord Herbert is blamed for his weak pursuing of her Majesty's favour. Want of spirit is laid to his charge, and that he is a melancholy young man"; on November 24, that "Lord Herbert is beloved at Court of all men"; and on November 29, that he "is highly favored" by the queen, and "is very well beloued here [in London] of all." These comments *sound* exactly like the friend portrayed in the sonnets.

In dedicating *Lucrece* to Southampton, Sh. did say, "VVhat I haue done is yours, what I haue to doe is yours," but what else could he have said? Such professions were the stock-in-trade of writers of dedications. They had a conventional and temporary, not a life-long, validity. So Thomas Wright, in *The Passions of the Mind*, 1604 (sig. A3), promised Southampton, "If these blasted leaves be acceptable to your Lordship, when the frutes are ripe, you shall receive a fatter crop"; but the fruits apparently failed to materialize. The *Lucrece* dedication offers no real difficulty to Pembroke's supporters, although if they assign dates of 1597 and later to the sonnets, they may take comfort in FURNIVALL's sensible remark (*Theatre*, 1897, XXX, 297 n.): "As to Shakspeare's love for Herbert giving 'the lie' to his professions of devotion in the *Adonis* and *Lucrece* a great deal may have happened in four years. There is no evidence that Southampton kept up his alliance with Shakspeare after 1594. He had plenty of other folk and work to look after; and we can't tie an enthusiastic young poet down to his dedications for his whole life." Indeed, one might suppose that Heming and Condell, as his intimates and fellow-actors, having learned from Sh.'s own lips who the friend of the sonnets was, used this information in dedicating the first folio to Pembroke; whereas no point of contact has ever been established between Sh. and the publisher who wrote the dedication to Mr. W. H. If the friend was, as LEE argues, Sh.'s literary patron, it appears significant that the actors in 1623 ignored the still-living Southampton in favor of the Pembrokes.

In this connection the speculations of WILLA MCC. EVANS (*Henry Lawes*, 1941, pp. 40-42) deserve mention. Printing a greatly changed version of 116 (see the notes and pp. 323 f., below) that was set to music by Henry Lawes, she suggests various possibilities. There were "obvious relationships" between Pembroke and Sh., and Lawes, "more in the spirit of performing a service than in that of indulging his own whims and fancies," may have set 116 to please Pembroke; or it may "have been selected by the Earl himself." Since poet and musician "had an obvious and important bond in their common interest in" Pembroke, Sh. may even "have presented Lawes with the sonnet."

Since anything may be (and has been) presented solemnly in Shakespearean theorizing, I may call attention to the emphasis the sonnets give to *spring* (seven times) and *April* (four times), an emphasis pointing rather to Pembroke, who was born in April (the same month as Sh.), than Southampton, whose birthday came in October. The friend is "only herauld to the gaudy spring" (1.10); Sh. laments being absent from him in the spring, when proud-

pied April has "put a spirit of youth in euery thing" (98.1-3); and in 102.5 he confesses, "Our loue was new, and then but in the spring." As has been suggested elsewhere (p. 60, above), at least one of the sonnets appears to have been inspired by the friend's birthday in April, not October.¹

Poor Sh. has been already abused too much by his commentators; but he *was* a business man; he *did*, according to LEE (*Life*, 1898, p. 159), disdain "no weapon of flattery in an endeavour to monopolise the bountiful patronage" of Southampton, or, as ADAMS (*Life*, 1923, p. 151) phrases it, he *did* seek the patronage of the young earl "who had recently come into control of his fortune, and was just beginning a career of extravagance." Both scholars had in mind the dedications of *Venus*, 1593, and *Lucrece*, 1594, and Southampton's traditional (perhaps apocryphal) largess. Yet in the very period when nearly everybody (except BUTLER and DOUGLAS) supposes that at least *some* of the lyrics were being written (shortly after the publication of *Lucrece*, 1594), Southampton was hard-up. STOPES (*Life of . . . Southampton*, 1922, p. 86) notes that in November, 1594,² he secured a release from his engagement to marry Elizabeth Vere by paying Burghley £5000 (BROOKE [ed. 1936, p. 79] rightly calls it a "huge forfeiture"), and comments on his "poverty": "Just at the most critical time of his finances, when he was trying to plan a harmonious life of travel and *economy*, he was called on to pay this heavy sum, *at once*." If Southampton was poor in 1594-1595, was not Sh. wise to look for money elsewhere—to begin celebrating the loveliness of a younger and less impoverished lord, soon himself to be a wealthy earl?³ Perhaps someone will now suggest that Sh. (or a suborned informer) had seen the second Earl of Pembroke's will, which, according to JOHN CHAMBERLAIN (*Letters*, ed. N. E. McClure, 1939, I, 116) left his widow, the subject of all verse, "as bare as he could and bestowing all on the young Lord even to her jewells."⁴ The poet could hardly

¹ Pembroke died childless, whereas Southampton fathered two sons and three daughters. Oddly enough, I do not recall any statement that Sh., looking into the seeds of time, anticipated this catastrophe, and hence in 1-17 warned young Herbert, "thy selfe . . . Vnlok'd on diest vnlesse thou get a sonne" (7.13 f.).

² Stopes gives only 1594; but in HENRY FOLEY's *Records of the . . . Society of Jesus*, 1878, IV, 49, Father Henry Garnett's letter (which she quotes) is dated November 19, 1594.

³ The third earl, JOHN AUBREY (*Natural History of Wiltshire*, ed. John Britton, 1847, p. 91) notes, "was a good scholar, and delighted in poetrie." He says further (p. 88): "The Earles of Pembroke were the most popular peers in the West of England; but one might boldly say, in the whole kingdome. The revenue of his [evidently the third earl's] family was, till about 1652, 16,000 li. per annum; but, with his offices and all, he had thirty thousand pounds per annum, and, as the revenue was great, so the greatnesse of his retinue and hospitality was answerable." Here and elsewhere (compare FRANCES B. YOUNG, *Mary Sidney*, 1912, p. 102) Aubrey confuses the second and third earls.

⁴ FRANCES B. YOUNG (the same, pp. 77-82) is not successful in dismissing Chamberlain's "gossip" as "quite without foundation." But let that pass.

have foreseen that after his imprisonment in 1601 Pembroke was to be subjected to a heavy fine by the irate queen; but by that time most, possibly all, of the sonnets had been written.

Speculations like these are far from being proof, though that word is commonly applied to them. "Southampton and Pembroke can play each other to a tie," H. D. GRAY (*P. M. L. A.*, 1915, XXX, 637) wrote, "but neither can show any compelling reason for the choice of him." The verdict of KITTREDGE (ed. 1936, p. 1491) is that "neither case is at all demonstrated or demonstrable." In the opinions of these and other scholars who refuse to be certain o'er uncertainty, the present writer concurs. Possibly a document contemporary with Sh., Pembroke, and Southampton will some day turn up to put beyond question the name of the poet's sweet and lovely boy. Up to date the evidence for both earls has remained, in the words of F. E. HILL (in Alden, ed. 1916, p. 468), "circumstantial and inferential." That it will be repeated, with varying degrees of assurance, so long as Sh. is read and studied one can hardly doubt.

WILLIAM HATHAWAY

The Hathaway family turn up unexpectedly in every page, except the title, of Q. NEIL, using the pseudonym "Rector," took pride (*N. & Q.*, February 27, 1858, pp. 164 f.) in being the first to intimate that W. H. was "one 'Hathaway'" (actually Richard Hathaway), the dramatist, and he inquired whether this person could have been Sh.'s brother-in-law. In 1861 NEIL (*Shakespeare*, pp. 106-108) substituted another guess: William Hathaway, born (STOPES, *Sh.'s Family*, 1901, p. 88) November 30, 1578. After Sh. retired to Stratford, "he may have wished to give his brother-in-law a start," and hence turned over the manuscript of the sonnets to him to sell. Thus Hathaway might well be called the "obtainer, collector—we might almost say, editor." Neil sent a copy of his book to the French librarian Chasles, and he reprinted his guess about Hathaway in 1864 and 1865 (*Athenaeum*, February 23, 1867, p. 254).¹ Two years later CHASLES (the same, February 16, pp. 223 f.), abandoning his former belief that W. H. meant William Herbert, acclaimed Hathaway as the procurer of the manuscript and Southampton as the friend therein celebrated. His letter aroused the indignation (the same, February 23, April 27, pp. 254, 552) of NEIL, whom he had failed to mention. The latter again in 1873 (the same, August 2, pp. 147 f.) cast a hearty vote for Sh.'s brother-in-law, "fourth son of Richard Hathaway." He must have been gratified when ELZE (*William Sh.* [1876], 1888, pp. 324 f.) called his theory the "most plausible" set forth up to that time. But the combined influence of one writer each in England, France, and Germany was too small. William Hathaway, no more or no less probable a Mr. W. H. than a dozen others, has entirely faded from consideration. Before taking his final bow, however, he was given a stellar (and an entirely imaginary) role by F. A. WHITE (*New Century Review*, 1900, VII, 228-242), who paid little heed to the ordinary genealogical charts. Sh. and William Hathaway, Sr., of Stratford, as appears from the dedication and 32-42,

¹ Compare R. G. C. (*Public Opinion*, 1864, V, 153): "Mr. W. H. must have been a relation of Shakespeare's. Had Shakespeare any brother-in-law? Was there a William Hathaway?"

were once bosom friends. When both fell in love with (a non-existent) Susannah Hamnet, W. H. "used his sister Ann as a decoy. With her . . . our poet committed . . . 'the forehand sin,' and thereupon the fair maiden, Susannah Hamnet, in righteous wrath spurned the fallen lad from her and became Hathaway's wife," while Sh. married Ann. Sh.'s bitterness towards his wife is repeatedly expressed in the sonnets, no less than in many plays. The hero of most of 1-126 is "obviously" . . . William Hathaway, junior." When Sh. begins to write them, naturally he emphasizes the theme, "Thou art thy mothers glasse," for "he sees the ever dear mother restored to all the beauty that charmed him some twenty years ago." By this "pleasing" and natural theory, Hathaway, Sr., is the only begetter in a two-fold sense: "(1) As the only *begetter* of the hero of the sonnets; (2) As the sole primary cause of their being written." Incidentally, Hathaway, Jr., met his uncle Sh. during a (hypothetical) visit in 1607 to the Globe Theater, in the "Green Room" of which his beauty so impressed Ben Jonson and other actors and poets as to result in the rival-poet incident.

WILLIAM HIMSELF

In 1860 BARNSTORFF (*Key*, 1862, p. 16), emphasizing the "Will" sonnets (135 and 136), suggested, "simply as a guess," that the letters W. H. "stand for the words *William* and *Himself*." The guess has since customarily been mentioned with a sneer as if it were the most idiotic ever made—as it certainly is not. Almost at once ASHER (*Magazin für die Literatur des Auslandes*, 1861, LIX, 476 f.) wrote of Barnstorff's contribution as useless and comic, OPZOOMER (*De Gids*, 1862, XXVI, i, 454-461) and KREYSSIG (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, 1864, XIII, 499-503) took glee in demolishing poor Barnstorff Himself, and DELIUS (*Jahrbuch*, 1865, I, 22) dismissed him as a modern Columbus who, according to hearsay, had patented his key in England. BODENSTEDT (Sh.'s *Sonette*, 1862, pp. 218-234) violently attacked Barnstorff's entire thesis. In his 1866 translation (p. 228) he said with considerable smugness: "From the very start Mr. Barnstorff's book seemed to me so silly that I would have passed it over in silence, if several of our leaders of critical opinion had not endorsed it with an enthusiasm that closely approximated the Barnstorffian nonsense. The snub I dealt it in . . . [1862] has meanwhile had a good effect, for no longer does anyone dare speak seriously of the 'Key.' The book is to be regarded as disposed of; hence I consider it unnecessary to print once more my previous refutation of it."

Yet the explanation is a corollary of BARNSTORFF's views of what the sonnets as a whole mean (Sh. [p. 14] "presents . . . a picture of his innerself [*sic*]. He describes the secret thoughts of his heart. . . . [He] dedicates these verses to his *genius*"), and they read almost like sober fact when compared to many later esoteric and mystical interpretations.¹ WIGSTON (*New Study*, 1884; see also his *Bacon Sh.*, 1888, p. 237) surely could have found nothing amusing in Barnstorff, for he insists (pp. 75, 73) that in many of the sonnets Sh. (Bacon) addresses himself "under the disguise of a friend," that the friend is Sh.'s "own

¹ R. G. C. (*Public Opinion*, 1864, V, 153) mentions a Dr. GREGG's guess in the Dublin *Evening Mail* that "Mr. W. H." means "Mr. William Himself." I have been unable to see the paper referred to.

ideal plan of art creation," his "unity and art from its as yet unrevealed and esoteric side." FLEAY (*Biographical Chronicle*, 1891, II, 212 f.) was fair enough to call attention to *Abuses Stript, and Whipt*, 1613, which George Wither (as HENRY BROWN [*Sonnets of Sh.*, 1870, pp. 11 f.] had earlier observed) inscribes: "To himselfe, G. W. wisheth all happinesse." This inscription, Fleay remarked, "which certainly parodies the Sonnet Dedication, looks as if he understood W. H. to be William Himself, or a misprint for W. S.," and thus anticipated Barnstorff. The suggestion, often since repeated,¹ is interesting, even if "certainly parodies" has an unjustified assurance. That Wither had ever seen, much less read, Q cannot be proved.²

Barnstorff's followers are far more numerous than the ordinary contemptuous references to him would indicate. CUMING WALTERS (*Mystery of Sh.'s Sonnets*, 1899, pp. 60 f.) agrees with him that the sonnets are "allegorical, and a diary of the poet's inner self." HÄFKER (*Was sagt Sh.?*, 1896, pp. 87-89), a Baconian, defends Barnstorff against Bodenstedt, Delius, and Kreyssig: they believe they have killed him, but he is taken very seriously in England and France. GODWIN (ed. 1900, p. 12) appropriates "William Himself" without mentioning his creator, perhaps because his memory was impaired: "Thorpe, having read a deal in the early sonnets about begetting 'a son,' and also in the later sonnets about one Mr. Will, . . . and desiring at the same time to be quaint and funny for himself, put the two together in order to tell us how the exclusive author ('the onlie begetter') was no other than W. H. (Will Himself), or the veritable Master William Shakespeare." J. M. (*Sh. Self-Revealed*, 1904, pp. 95, 92), even before he had read the German's book, reached the conclusion that most of 1-126 "are addressed to the Spirit of Beauty, but some are addressed to the Reader or Posterity, to Himself, to his Muse, to Time," and that "the writer himself, or Mr. Will Himself, or Mr. W. H., was the *only* inspirer." Sh. used the abbreviation because in 135 and 136 he had played upon his Christian name. DOWNING's pronouncement (*Sh. as Pan-Judge*, 1913, p. 13) that Barnstorff has "really scaled great heights in consideration of the subject" sufficiently describes his own book. ROE (*Sir Francis Bacon's Own Story*, 1918, p. 83) favors "Mr. W. Himself," and how he translates "Mr. W." to "Mr. U. U." to "Bacon" is a stunt that readers should personally examine. Two contemporary women have paid their respects to Barnstorff's theory. It "appeals to me," KATHARINE M. WILSON (*Calcutta Review*, 1930, 3d series, XXXVII, 182) confesses, "but I am afraid the evidence for William Hall is more tangible." No such baseless fears distress BEATRICE BARNSTORFF FRAME (*W. Sh.'s Lied*, 1931, pp. 13 f.), who, as a fine gesture, dedicates her book to the long-dead Barnstorff, and declares: Mr. W. H. "is William Himself! The poet himself! The recurring motif of the sonnets is sounded in the title: the great longing of the author for that immortality which was promised us by the 'ever-living poet'! There is only one 'everliving poet,' the creator of heaven and earth." KELLER (*Jahrbuch*, 1931, LXVII, 73 f.) says the writer "may be a

¹ GOLLANCZ (ed. 1896, p. xxiii n.), for instance, writes that Wither "seems to have anticipated this stupendous discovery" of Barnstorff's.

² LEE (*Life*, 1898, p. 399 n.) says that Wither's dedication was aimed not at Q "but at a feature common to scores of books."

daughter or granddaughter" of the dedicatee, and disposes of her work somewhat caustically. But such piety to one's ancestor, especially a much-ridiculed ancestor, deserves more charitable treatment.

A mere variant of the William Himself theory was evolved by BRAE in 1869 and communicated to the Royal Society of Literature by INGLEBY in June, 1873 (see *Athenaeum*, July 5, pp. 18 f.): *onlie begetter* means "sole author," and "W. H." is a misprint for "W. S.," Sh.'s initials. This notion was developed in 1907 by VON KRALIK (*Kultur*, VIII, 393), who asserted that Thorpe published the sonnets without the poet's consent but dedicated Q to him: "I consider the H. [in W. H.] a misprint for S., originating in the Gothic H. of the manuscript, which was easy to mistake for an S." Such speculations appealed to SNIDER (*Biography*, 1922, p. 259), because Sh. "in the title of the book is practically declared to be its only true begetter." But they are too elementary for RICE (*Story of Hamlet*, 1924, p. 362). As he informs us, "'H' is a Rosicrucianism," and "Mr. W. H." symbolizes "Mr. W. Hamlet or Bacon."

WILLIAM HALL

It was foreordained that, sooner or later, Mr. W. H. would be named as one William Hall. FORSYTH in 1867 (*Shakspeare*, p. 24) was perhaps the first to express a belief that by a printer's error in Q "W. HALL" had been transformed into "W. H. ALL." The same idea was set forth by UNDERHILL (*N. & Q.*, March 22, April 19, 1890, pp. 227 f., 302 f.), who thought the period in "H. ALL" either a mistake or else consciously designed to make the word "do double duty," and who from 108.8, "when first I hallowed thy faire name," decided that William Hall belonged to a family living at Hallow near Worcester. C. A. WARD (the same, p. 303) hastened to applaud Underhill's words.

Presumably LEE held no brief for a misplaced period in "H. ALL," though many people since have held it. But he is the guardian angel of a procurer (not an inspirer) William Hall, a stationer's assistant, who (*Life*, 1898, p. 92) "was professionally engaged, like Thorpe, in procuring 'copy.' In 1606 'W. H.' won a conspicuous success in that direction, and conducted his operations under cover of the familiar initials. In that year 'W. H.' announced that he had procured a neglected manuscript poem—'A Foure-fould Meditation'—by the Jesuit Robert Southwell who had been executed in 1595, and he published it with a dedication (signed 'W. H.') vaunting his good fortune in meeting with such treasure-trove.¹ When Thorpe dubbed 'Mr. W. H.' . . . 'the onlie begetter (*i. e.* obtainer or procurer) of these ensuing sonnets,' he

¹ [EDMONDS (*Athenaeum*, October 25, November 22, 1873, pp. 528 f., 661 f.) called attention to this W. H., suggesting that he was likewise the collector of Q, but not giving him a name. H. J. L. ROBBIE (*R. E. S.*, 1929, V, 200-202) argues that *A Foure-fold Meditation* was probably by Philip Howard, first Earl of Arundel, to whom two manuscripts ascribe it, the other two manuscripts naming no author. He says that W. H., probably the same as the W. H. of Q, assigned it to Southwell "to secure a large circulation for the poem, and increase his profits. By 1606 the memory of Arundel would almost be forgotten."]

merely indicated that that personage was the first of the pirate-publisher fraternity to procure a manuscript of Shakespeare's sonnets and recommend its surreptitious issue. In accordance with custom, Thorpe gave Hall's initials only, because he was an intimate associate who was known by those initials to their common circle of friends."

The sole evidence LEE gives for identifying the W. H. of Q and the W. H. of the *Foure-fold Meditation* is, characteristically, the assertions (pp. 402 f.) that "there is little doubt that the 'W. H.' of the Southwell volume was William Hall" and that Hall was the only man with the initials W. H. "who there is reason to suppose was on familiar terms with Thorpe." Actually there is just as much reason to suppose that Mr. W. H., if he belonged to the Stationers' Company, was William Holme, a bookseller in London and Chester, 1589-1615, publisher of many of Churchyard's works (McKERRROW, *Dictionary of Printers*, 1910, p. 142), as William Hall;¹ and since Lee's comments have been repeated all over the globe as valid proof, it is worth while to mention THURSTON's denial (*Month*, 1930, CLVI, 433 f.) that the W. H. of the *Foure-fold Meditation* is William Hall. The latter, he says (I have not verified his statement), was a publisher of eminently Protestant books, whereas the *Foure-fold Meditation* contains a remarkable tribute to the Blessed Virgin; "hardly less difficult is it to believe that a publisher whose connection seems to have been formed on strongly religious lines [like Hall's], would welcome the dedication to himself as the 'onlie begetter' of so compromising a work as the Shakespeare Sonnets"—a work abounding in plague spots.

William Hall's activities as a printer are summarized by LEE (p. 402) thus: he was apprenticed to John Alde, 1577-1584, and then admitted to the freedom of the Stationers' Company. Until 1606 he was connected with the publishing trade "in a dependent capacity, doubtless as assistant to a master-printer." In that year he got permission to set up a press of his own, in 1608 he began business, and by 1614 he had printed twenty volumes. I have not checked all these details (they differ somewhat from those given in McKERRROW's *Dictionary of Printers*, 1910, p. 121), since there is no proof of a connection of any kind between our Mr. W. H. and the stationer's assistant Hall. LEE's assumptions, however, were so guilefully presented as to obscure that fact. He seems temporarily to have recognized their weakness, for seven years later (ed. 1905, p. 40 n.) he admitted that the name of Mr. W. H. "cannot be stated positively," although he believed him to have been the stationer William Hall. In later editions of the *Life* (as 1915, p. 683), however, once again "there is little doubt that the 'W. H.' of the Southwell volume was Mr. William Hall," and he "in all probability" was the Mr. W. H. of Q.

Immediately after Lee's *Life* was published, once more a procession formed, this time shouting for William Hall, and near its head was "SYLVANUS URBAN" (*G. M.*, 1898, CCLXXXV, 617-620). A similar procession was quickly organized in Germany. In its ranks was SCHÜCKING (*Frankfurter Zeitung*, March 26, 1907, erstes Morgenblatt, p. 2), who, however, made the sensible

¹ Compare CHAMBERS (*William Sh.*, 1930, I, 566): "All his [Lee's] equations seem to me quite unwarrantable, in view of the commonness of the initials W. H. and the name Hall."

suggestion that the personages of the dedication have no connection with those in the sonnets, and that Hall, according to Thorpe's words, would receive "eternitie" because his name in the dedication will forever be joined to the poems. HESSEN (*Leben Sh.'s*, 1904, pp. 219 f.) refused to march with his compatriots; he could not believe that even Thorpe would have been so crude and indecent as to dedicate his book to a common thief who had stolen the manuscript of Sh.'s lyrics. A French critic, HENRY (*Literature*, 1900, VI, 320), also stood to one side, arguing that since, on Lee's own showing, William Hall had begun to print books in 1608, it was entirely unlikely that he would have given or sold to Thorpe in 1609 such valuable literary property as this "precious manuscript."¹ Lee's hypothesis received some support from RALEIGH (*Shakespeare*, 1907, pp. 86 f.): "There are grave difficulties in accepting it, but perhaps they are not insuperable, and it has one immense advantage: it makes waste-paper of all the acrostic literature which has gathered round the initials of Mr. W. H., and leaves us free to consider the Sonnets apart from the dedication." Then the weighty affirmative of POLLARD (*Sh.'s Fight with the Pirates*, 1917, p. 32) was given unreservedly in its favor; and CARPENTER (*Catholic World*, 1918, CVI, 505) and others joined in.

The discussion took an unexpected turn when in 1923 the Oxfordian B. R. WARD announced (*Mystery of "Mr. W. H.,"* pp. 20-23; *T. L. S.*, May 24, p. 356) that he had found at Hackney, the home of "Sh."-Oxford, the record of a marriage on August 4, 1608, between a William Hall and a Margery Gryffyn. He assumed that the bride was the Margaret Gryffin, "daughter of Edward a scryvener," who had been baptized at St. Saviour's, Southwark, on December 28, 1592, and that the groom was the stationer's assistant featured by Lee. From these suppositions, Ward jumped to the conclusion that Q, published nine months after their marriage, was a "suitable wedding present" for Hall, because Thorpe's dedication expressed the hope that he would have a son. Indeed, "what more suitable wedding wish than the one" in the dedication could he have desired? I can see nothing in Ward's discussion to prove that his William Hall of Hackney is to be connected in any fashion with Thorpe or Sh.'s Q. (THURSTON [*Month*, 1930, CLVI, 433], in downright fashion, dismisses it as untenable, "absolutely crazy.") Others have been less obtuse. FORT (*Two Dated Sonnets*, 1924, p. 38; see also the *Library*, December, 1928, p. 317), for instance, detecting the old misprint in line 3 of the dedication ("W. H. ALL."), accepted Ward's findings without hesitancy: "The 'Begetter' . . . means . . . the 'person who obtained' . . . ; William Hall's surname is printed in full in line 3; and the 'eternitie' wished in line 4 is merely the birth of a son to Hall, the reference being to . . . [17.13 f.] and other passages of similar import in . . . [1-19]." Naturally the Oxfordians welcomed the discoveries of Ward as a kind of new gospel. PERCY ALLEN (*Case for Edward de Vere*, 1930, pp. 140-147) joyfully accepted the identification and contributed an extraordinary detail: "The editor to whom William Hall entrusted . . . [the sonnets] was, it seems, none other than Francis Bacon"; while PHILLIPS (*Tragic Story*

¹ So POOLER (ed. 1918, p. 2): "If William Hall was the man, it seems strange that he did not print and publish the Sonnets himself, he had a press at the time."

of *Sh.*, 1932, p. 133) added, "Adonis is Mr. W. H." But somewhat unnaturally MACKAIL (*Approach to Sh.*, 1930, p. 114) and FRIEP (*Shakespeare*, 1938, II, 714) joined in the applause. The former strangely characterizes Ward's and Fort's explanation of the W. H. business as "one of the most ingenious reconstructions made by modern criticism based on skilled research." In it, according to BROOKE (ed. 1936, pp. 243 f.), "there may be significance." ALDEN BROOKS (*Will Sh. and the Dyer's hand*, 1943, pp. 142 f.) makes no reservations about its significance, even though he considers "William Hall . . . a red herring. The sonnets may have passed through his hands at one time, but they were dedicated to his initials as the only begetter in order to throw a false scent and hide the real person from whom the sonnets were obtained."

Apparently it is only Lee's, not Ward's, Hall who has won the allegiance of M. A. SHAABER (*Some Forerunners*, 1929, pp. 265 f.) and HARDIN CRAIG (*Shakespeare*, 1931, p. 121), the latter describing Lee's as "the best of these theories, itself somewhat lame." But too much agreement about any sonnet problem is suspicious and alarming, and so one is reassured to find GROTH (*Beiblatt*, 1930, XLI, 138) saying that Thorpe's dedication is ironic. Furthermore, of all *Sh.*'s family only one member, his daughter Mrs. Susanna Hall, understood and appreciated his work. Hence, it would seem likely that a W. Hall, having heard her mention the sonnets, secured a copy and gave it to the publisher. Groth bounteously fathers an alternative theory: *Sh.* had many enemies, and possibly a malicious rival got hold of the sonnets and published them in order to compromise their author in the eyes of the puritan bourgeoisie of Stratford, a town which as early as 1602 banned all theatrical performances.

William Hall seems to me as much a figment of unsound speculation as William Hughes.¹

WILLIAM HERVEY (HARVEY)

MASSEY (*Athenaeum*, April 27, 1867, p. 552) apparently deserves the credit, such as it is, for naming as a possible Mr. W. H. the stepfather of Lord Southampton. Sir William Hervey, or Harvey, of Kidbrooke, Kent (*Complete Peerage*, 1896, VII, 194; 1926, VI, 516), a veteran of the Armada fight, was knighted by Essex at Cadiz in June, 1596. Apparently he served as a member of Parliament in 1601 and again in 1604-1611. About September, 1598, he married Southampton's mother.² That lady, Mary Browne, daughter of the first Viscount Montagu, had had two previous husbands: the second Earl of Southampton, died October 4, 1581, and Sir Thomas Heneage, died October 17, 1595. She herself died before November 14, 1607, and on February 5, 1608, Hervey married Cordell Annesley, of Kidbrooke and Lee, Kent. He was created Baron Hervy of Rosse in 1620 and Baron Hervey of Kidbrooke in 1628, but the titles became extinct with his death in July, 1642. He was buried in Westminster Abbey.

¹ In AINSLIE's translation of CROCE's *Ariosto, Sh. and Corneille*, 1920, p. 123, "the retail bookseller, William Hell," is mentioned as one of the W. H. candidates. Shortly we may expect an article proving that this (misprinted) name is referred to in 147.14, "Who art as black as *Hell*."

² So R. W. GOULDING (Walpole Society, 1920, VIII, 25), correcting the date, May, 1598, given in the *D. N. B.* See p. 220 n., below.

Needless to say, only those who believe Southampton the friend of the sonnets would find Hervey at all acceptable as a "procuring" Mr. W. H.; and, since Pembroke long had the majority of adherents, Massey's hint was ignored for years. Then in 1886 FLEAY (*Chronicle History*, p. 62), presumably believing himself original, called attention to Hervey as probably "the original suggester" that Sh. write sonnets imploring young Southampton to marry. He also explained the *well-wishing adventurer* of the dedication (a phrase unquestionably applied by Thorpe to himself) as a further proof of Mr. W. H.'s being Hervey, for the latter was in 1609 busy with affairs of the Virginia Company, "*adventurer* being the current phrase for explorer of unknown regions." Some of this material FLEAY repeated in 1891 (*Biographical Chronicle*, II, 212 f.), adding that probably Southampton, unwilling to sponsor the sonnets openly because of the discreditable dark-woman episode, gave them to his stepfather to publish. In such a case, let us admit, Thorpe might very well have expressed his gratitude in a dedication to the only furnisher of the manuscript.

The Hervey hypothesis made little progress under Fleay's egis, but the case was altered when, without acknowledgment, STOPES, now an ardent Southamptonite, took it over. In 1891 (*Beiblatt*, I, 291 f.) she withdrew an earlier suggestion (*Poet-Lore*, 1890, II, 477-479; *Jahrbuch*, 1890, XXV, 202 f.) that the obscure early poet, William Hunnis, was Mr. W. H., because of her discovery of his death in 1597, a date which she was unable to harmonize with the dates she assigned many of the sonnets.¹ A few years later (*Athenaeum*, March 26, 1898, p. 406) she "put forward the suggestion tentatively" that Hervey himself wrote the dedication for Southampton, meaning to say, "To the onlie begetter [Southampton] . . . , Mr. W. H. all happinesse, and that eternitie promised by our ever-living poet, wisheth." Henceforth STOPES regarded herself as Hervey's champion and protector. In 1900 (the same, August 4, pp. 154 f.) she advanced the hypothesis that on the original notebook containing the sonnets was "inscribed within a true-love knot 'W. H.,' or *William* [Sh.] and *Henry* [Wriothesley]." When Hervey turned the book over to Thorpe, that publisher, seeing the initials, thought the sonnets had been written in honor of its obtainer, Sir William Hervey. Since the latter had married Cordelia Ansley (*sic*) in 1608, Thorpe wished him a fruitful marriage in a phrase of *double entendre*, that *eternitie* and so on meaning "beget children." Again STOPES (ed. 1904, pp. xlv-xlvi) wrote: "The only person whom [*sic*] I think *might* fit all the phrases in Thomas Thorpe's dedication was *Mr. William Harvey*. He has been known to have been consulted in the days before the Sonnets, when every one was badgering the young earl [Southampton] to marry. It is *very probable* that he suggested Shakespeare's writing the Sonnets to move the young earl's mind." The dowager Countess of Southampton married Hervey in 1598,² a year (*sic*) after he was knighted. She died in 1607. Very likely a manuscript copy of the sonnets had been in her house, and Hervey

¹ To Hunnis's *Hive Full of Honey*, 1578, Thomas Newton contributed verses describing him as "in winter of thine age." If Hunnis had been Sh.'s sweet boy, perhaps less scandal would have resulted! See *The Paradise of Dainty Devices*, ed. Rollins, 1927, p. liii.

² This date is uncertain: see STOPES's *Life of . . . Southampton*, 1922, pp. 117, 140, and p. 219 n., above.

sent it on to Thorpe. To a man like Hervey, the dedication "can be considered perfectly suitable. People frequently spoke of a 'knight' then as 'Mr.'—the Countess always did so of her [second] husband, Sir Thomas Heneage.¹ Harvey was a distinguished man and a friend of letters." Stopes carefully labels this "a hypothesis." Evidently she assumes that *begetter* means the procurer of the copy, but she does not make clear why "our everliving poet" promised him "all happiness and eternity." In 1908 (*Sh.'s Environment*, 1914, pp. 149, 159 f.) and in 1922 (*Life of . . . Southampton*, pp. 343 f.) she repeated her theory with absolute conviction of its truth.

The Hervey ensign, shoved by Stopes upon the ramparts of scholarship, quickly drew patriots to the newly fortified shrine, among them being BRANDL (*Sh.'s Sonette*, 1913, pp. xlvii f.) and RITTER (*Der unbekannte Sh.*, 1922, p. 263)—who added nothing to the discussion. To be sure, WOLFF (*E. S.*, 1916, L, 159) refused to salute the flag, because he could not believe that a man in Hervey's social position would have arranged to publish such compromising matter as Q contained, especially through a second-rater like Thorpe. But J. D. WILSON (*Monthly Criterion*, 1927, VI, 163 f.) was an eager recruit. He noticed that Southampton opposed his mother's marriage to Hervey, who remarried in the next year after her death. Very likely, then, Hervey arranged for the publication of Q as "an act of spite," and Sh. and Southampton must have been "chagrined at it." Thorpe's phrase about "all happinesse" was directed at Hervey's second marriage.

The Fleay-Stopes theory was endorsed by ROBERTSON (*Genuine in Sh.*, 1930, pp. 61-63), DE CHAMBRUN (*Sh. Rediscovered*, 1938, pp. 164-187), and ALEXANDER (*Sh.'s Life*, 1939, pp. 94 f.). CHAMBERS (*William Sh.*, 1930, I, 565 f.) grants that, if *begetter* means "procurer," "the best guess" about Mr. W. H. for Southamptonites is Hervey. Earlier S. S. ASHBAUGH (*S. A. B.*, 1924, I, 14) had assured his readers: "All the evidence points to . . . Southampton as the young man in question, and to Sir William Harvey as the possessor of the manuscript, to whom the dedication was made; and . . . no evidence points to any other person for either place, . . . [so that] the question may be deemed to be settled." He was wrong. Questions about Sh., luckily for "scholarship," are practically never settled. For my own part I share the skepticism of PRAZ (*English Studies*, 1928, X, 24; see also his remarks in *Cultura*, 1922, II, 37): "I confess to a partiality for the picture of the widowed husband [Hervey] roaming about in the empty house and finding, among dusty family papers, 'Shakespeare's Sonnets': it is so delightfully Victorian, so soothing and refreshing after Butler's sea-cook."²

MISCELLANEOUS THEORIES

A few other interpretations of W. H. and the friend—sometimes two individuals, sometimes one person—deserve passing mention. PETER CUNNING-

¹ [The *N. E. D.* (1905) says: "Down to the 16th c. or a little later, *master* could be prefixed to the name of a knight or a bishop."]

² No American library reporting to the Library of Congress has a copy of J. G. JOHANNES's *Mysteries about Sh.'s Sonnets*, 1928 (*Jahrbuch*, 1934, LXX, 188), which is said to contain strange news of another William Harvey.

HAM (editing Campbell's *Specimens*, 1841, p. lxxi n.) characterized the friend as "a youth of both sexes, . . . some hermaphrodite or Stella of his [Sh.'s] own fancy" who may or may not be Mr. W. H. "All is conjecture," except that W. H. is not Pembroke; "Mr. W. H. was well enough known in his own day; what is enigmatical to us was no obscurity then." WHITE (*Sh.'s Scholar*, 1854, pp. 473 f.) contented himself with saying that an unknown W. H. was the man who hired Sh. to write, since it was the custom for non-poetical Elizabethans "to seek assistance" from poets—a common assertion for which (see p. 141, above) little or no proof has ever been given.¹ Years later BLATT (*M. P.*, 1913, XI, 135-140; see p. 160, above), apparently in the belief that his views were novel, from an examination of 29, 62, 72, 73, and others concluded that "the sonnets were written by Shakespeare for some one else—for this senile, lame Mr. W. H., who simply paid the young poet to write love-letters for him." Meanwhile, a writer in *Fraser's Magazine*, 1855 (LII, 407-409), had restated, in less detailed fashion, the view that GEORGE CHALMERS had urged in 1797 and 1799: Sh.'s only motive in addressing his lyrics ostensibly "to a man was the desire of varying the worn-out topics of former sonnetteers," but in all probability he had QUEEN ELIZABETH in mind, and he "took this indirect means" of urging her to marry. "It was a subject on which the queen was extremely sensitive, and which she would not suffer even her ministers to urge upon her directly; hence, perhaps, the artifice of addressing the sonnets to a man." "It appears to us by no means improbable," he added, "that 'Mr. W. H.' may have been some common friend of Shakspeare and Thorpe, who suggested the publication to both parties."

In 1865 (*N. & Q.*, December 2, pp. 449 f.) W. C. HAZLITT attributed to F. S. ELLIS (whom he supposed to have been the compiler of a C. J. Stewart book catalog) "the only sensible proposal . . . yet broached," that W. H. was WILLIAM HAMMOND, "a cotemporary patron of letters, to whom we find dedicated an extant MS. of Middleton's *Game of Chesse* (performed in 1624)." "All the other theories," he bravely added, "may be safely dismissed for ever." Temporarily he converted STOPES, for at a meeting of the New Sh. Society on October 11, 1889 (*Academy*, 1889, XXXVI, 275) where Furnivall and everybody else except herself were endorsing Tyler's Pembroke theory, she cast a solitary vote for Hammond. Stopes quickly changed her mind, and by 1902 W. C. HAZLITT (*Shakespear*, pp. 201, 190 f.), while frankly admitting that "there is absolutely not a tittle" of proof about W. H.'s name, once again brought forward Hammond, this time attributing "the only sensible proposal" merely to an old book catalog by C. J. STEWART,² and tentatively equating his candidate with a William Hammond of Nonnington, Kent. *A Game at Chess* is

¹ BEDDOES in May, 1827 (*Works*, 1935 ed., p. 632), wrote of some lines attributed by Goethe to Sh.: "It may be that these lines were written hastily by him [Sh.] for W. H. or perhaps some Court gentleman, to serve as a complimentary poem or song for his lady." E. M. C. (*Academy*, 1906, LXXI, 213) suggested that Sh. wrote the sonnets "on commission for somebody else and in that individual's person," getting "paid a few pounds for the work."

² Who sold the manuscript of the play to the Bodleian in the 1860's: see BALD's edition, p. 28.

preserved in various manuscript copies, but in only one (the Bodleian) is there a dedication, a facsimile reproduction of which will be found in R. C. BALD's edition, 1929 (facing p. 33). With no reference to Mr. W. H., Bald (p. 137) writes that "Hammond seems to have belonged to a coterie of Middleton's civic patrons." There let him remain, a tomb without a monument. He has no place, either as procurer or inspirer, in Q.

Various other possible W. H.'s were enumerated by NEIL (*Athenaeum*, April 27, 1867, p. 552), who "thinks" he has seen the names of HENRY WALKER, Sh.'s godson, and WILLIAM HAUGHTON, the dramatist, suggested. He also (like W. C. HAZLITT, *N. & Q.*, December 2, 1865, p. 449) mentioned HENRY WILLOBIE, supposed author of the cryptic *Willobie His Avis* (see pp. 295-313, below), who until the present day has continued to turn up like a bad penny.

ROBERT DEVEREUX, second EARL OF ESSEX, has frequently been elevated to the honorable (or dishonorable) seat of Sh.'s friend. CONRAD first hinted about Essex in 1881 (*Jahrbuch*, XVI, 323). Three years later (the same, 1884, XIX, 241-245), he developed and confirmed his theory, partly by a rearrangement of Q (see p. 92, above), partly by dating the earlier sonnets around 1589. Such a dating automatically eliminates Pembroke; Southampton eliminates himself by being the subject of the *Venus* and *Lucrece* dedications, for it is incredible that Sh. would have dedicated a book in 1593 and 1594 to a friend who had been faithless to him in 1592. Quite on a par with this reasoning is the proof that follows: *A Midsummer Night's Dream* was written for Essex's wedding in the spring of 1590; the Hamlet story was changed by Sh. to correspond with incidents in his friend's life; the latter's praises are hymned in the chorus of *Henry V*, act V, and his speech on the scaffold (1601) is repeated, in part verbatim, by Buckingham in *Henry VIII*. If one is still unconvinced, then Essex's letters show marked parallels to *Hamlet* and the sonnets. The reference in Q to his beautiful mother (3.9) and his dead father (13.14) are clear. Besides, he had the feminine beauty stressed in 20, and he was something of a libertine and an adulterer.

Published in an important scholarly journal, Conrad's farrago attracted more attention than it deserved. It was solemnly discussed and as solemnly rejected by HESSEN in 1904 (*Leben Sh.'s*, pp. 204 f.), mainly on the grounds that Essex, who was married, never followed anybody's advice (a reference to Sh.'s urging of marriage in 1-17), and that he was too old to have stolen the poet's mistress. But it was adopted and dragged out to preposterous length by L'HOMMEDÉ in 1923 (*Revue de Paris*, II, 171-192) and 1932 (*Secret de Sh.*); and it converted a number of Baconians like REICHEL (*Sh.-Litteratur*, 1887, pp. 462 f.), who added further impossible details, W. H. BURR (*Baconiana*, May, October, 1892, pp. 37, 93), who says the sonnets were addressed to "Essex and his bride, A.D. 1590,"¹ R. M. THEOBALD (the same, February, 1894, pp. 184 f.), and R. J. D. S. (the same, January, 1906, pp. 43-46), who contributed the not widely known facts that *Rose* (1.2) means "Ro. Es." (Robert Essex), and that

¹ BURR (*Sonnets of Sh.*, 1883, p. 12; see also his *Bacon and Sh.*, 1886, p. 26) boasts, "no one . . . ever suspected until July 31, 1883 [the day on which he first read the sonnets], that 'W. H.' was the accomplished and famous Earl of Essex."

Hews (20.7) refers (see p. 185, above) to the title "Earl of Essex and Ewe." Indeed, he believes that the poet's desire to pun on Ewe explains "the change in address from the 2nd person singular to the 2nd person plural" in many of the sonnets.

HAMNET SH., the poet's son, has been spotted in various sonnets by imaginative writers, but it was reserved for S. S. TRAVERS (*Sh.'s Sonnets*, 1881) to inform the world that the boy in question, Mr. W. H., was (p. 13) "not a son by Anne Hathaway, but . . . an illegitimate one by some other woman—the evidence would go to show, by some woman of high rank." In punning fashion (pp. 15 f.) 33.9 (*my Sunne*) refers to this individual; and 36.9 f. contains the father's lament that he cannot acknowledge his son "before the world." In 1-17 (p. 20) Sh. makes "an incessant appeal to his son to marry; and, it may be suspected, at the mother's instance." The appeal was granted: the son (p. 6) "was married after the 17th was written, and . . . the mother died before the 31st."

JESSE JOHNSON (*Testimony*, 1899, pp. 94 n., 97-99) convinced himself that the sonnets were composed by an unknown poet whose "name was William," and that possibly the initials W. H. "may refer to him." Further, "it is very probable" that SH. "was the friend or patron around whom" the sonnets move and "to whom most of them were addressed." Barnstorff is here out-Barnstorffed. On the other hand, W. A. HENDERSON (*N. & Q.*, November 1, 1902, pp. 343 f.) believed the lyrics to be directed at EDMUND SH., who was baptized on May 3, 1580, and died, aged twenty-seven, in December, 1607. The poet's son Hamnet had died in August, 1596, a fact explaining "the heir-hunger, the passionate, pathetic pleading of the poet to a younger man [his brother] . . . to marry and beget an heir, that so the family name and fame might be perpetuated." In several poems Sh. chides, but forgives, Edmund, "who had waywardly chosen a mistress in lieu of a wife," and whose bastard son Edward was buried at St. Giles, Cripplegate, on August 12, 1607. As a theory, Henderson's is far from bad, is indeed much more sensible than many others; but, like Johnson, he could offer no evidence in substantiation. Nor could BORGHESI (*Petrarch and His Influence*, 1906, p. 111). He remarks that the initials W. H. "for about seventy years" after 1609 "were believed to stand for a woman's name," though most critics are now inclined to regard the sonnets as "addressed to a male friend." If so, why didn't Sh. write the name in full? The fact that he used initials "might cause even the least carping mind to think of a woman rather than of a man." Borghesi's statements contain a number of errors, but it is strange that no one has acted on his hint by producing a biographical sketch of Sh.'s master-mistress, or mistress-master, WILHELMINA HUGHES.¹

In 1914 J. W. TROTMAN (Southwell's *Triumphs over Death*, pp. 131 f.) explained "that the ideal personality around which so many of the Sonnets are written is in reality that of Father Southwell," the Jesuit poet who was executed in 1595. "The opening Sonnets . . . have generally been understood as an exhortation to the person addressed to get married and beget children." Actually Sh. is stressing to SOUTHWELL "the idea of *mental generation* (common

¹ G. S. VIERECK came near doing so: see p. 184, above.

to all artists of every description as the means of their eternization)," as "is most evident" in 18, 32, 54, 60, 65, 81, 107, and others. The idea "is very clearly expressed" in 77.11, "Those children nurst, deliuerd from thy braine." Alas, that "the muddy-minded critics" (p. 135) have almost entirely ignored this "intelligible explanation."

Tackling the problem of the friend and ignoring W. H., two writers have expanded Wilde's theory. SHORE (*Sh.'s Self*, 1920, pp. 87, 89) none too seriously suggests that a number of the "'boy-theme' Sonnets were written to some of the young actors of the day"; "if a man must be sought for who stole away one of Shakespeare's lady-loves, and so gave him a theme for a Sonnet sequence, why not fix upon his friend, Burbage?" G. A. TAYLOR (*N. & Q.*, April 3, 1926, p. 243) substitutes the famous comedian WILLIAM KEMP, with whom Sh. is "known" to have fallen out around 1600. Kemp got the sonnets from the dark woman.

A previously unheard-of candidate, WILLIAM HOLGATE, was presented by EDMUND DRING around 1927. His employers, the London booksellers Quaritch, Ltd., had bought a manuscript containing, among numerous verses by Corbet, Strode, Wotton, and other Jacobean poets, five poems signed "W. H." as well as a version of Sh.'s 106. W. G. P. had described the manuscript in 1921 (*T. L. S.*, September 15, p. 596) as compiled by "one of the [Essex] Holgate family—presumably John Holgate, who was of the Middle Temple in 1626," and as dating between 1603 and 1626. CHAMBERS (*William Sh.*, 1930, II, 222 f.) examined it "carefully in 1925," and decided that the collection cannot "have been completed quite so soon" as 1626, and that the compiler, if not W. G. P.'s John Holgate, of Walden, who died in 1673, was perhaps William Holgate (1618-1646), of Great Bardfield.¹ DE RICCI (*Census of . . . Manuscripts*, 1937, II, 1510) set the date around 1630. Evidently these last two experts were unimpressed by the announcement in the London *Daily Telegraph*, February 3, 1928 (p. 9; see also the *New York Times*, February 3, p. 16), that Dring had "released" (in other words, sold) to "one of the most famous libraries in America" (the Morgan, of New York) this commonplace book of William Holgate, or Mr. W. H., on the express condition that it be submitted for study to "the most erudite authorities in American universities." Dring had decided that Mr. W. H. "was young William Holgate, the seventeen-year-old son of a wealthy innkeeper at the Rose and Crown, Saffron Walden.² . . . It is known that Shakespeare and his travelling company were at Saffron Walden in 1607, . . . and Mr. Dring holds that Shakespeare, when staying as leader of his company at the principal hostel of the town, met young Holgate, who was a promising young poetaster, and, as the custom of the period was, addressed a number of sonnets to his engaging young friend."³ The "most

¹ Other William Holgates are mentioned in W. C. METCALFE's *Visitations of Essex*, Harleian Society, 1878, XIII, 421.

² [Dring gives his candidate the dates of 1590-1634(?). The Rose and Crown tavern did not belong to the Holgates until 1623.]

³ J. T. MURRAY, *English Dramatic Companies*, 1910, II, 387, gives the date as 1605-1606. There is no evidence that Sh. was present when his company acted at Saffron Walden. The W. H. of the manuscript wrote elegies on two

erudite" professors in America, whoever they may have been, either neglected a great opportunity or else kept ominously silent. Perhaps the date (1607) of Sh.'s first alleged meeting with the alleged compiler William Holgate discouraged them. The Dutchman TER HAGHE (*Neophilologus*, 1932, XVII, 291) did devote several paragraphs to the engaging tapster, only to conclude that Sh. could not have been so impulsive as to address over a hundred sonnets to a village youth whom he barely knew. For better reasons than that Holgate must take his place in an unhonored crypt with Butler's cook or William Hathaway, Jr.

B. C. KERR, in his Ohio State University thesis, *Suggested Identification for the Rival Poet*, etc., 1930—so RUTH HUGHEY informs me—deserted all the human beings that had been proposed to find Sh.'s friend in PRINCE HAL, the careless prince who had changed to a "Princely King." "It is easy [for Kerr] to feel that a relatively large number of the first 126 Sonnets are more nearly applicable to Hal and to his circumstances than to the character and circumstances of any one of the Poet's contemporaries." The suggestion is all the more novel since Sh. becomes his own rival poet, Cleopatra his dark woman.

Among recent identifications of the friend, distinct from Mr. W. H., WALTER ASTON and CHARLES BEST have tardily been included. NEWDIGATE (*T. L. S.*, November 9, 16, 1933, pp. 774, 795), assuming the rival poet to be Drayton, proposes that the patron for whose favor he was striving with Sh. was Aston. To this gentleman Drayton dedicated his *Barons' Wars*, 1603, and *Poems*, 1605. He was born at Charlecote, Warwick, in July, 1584, and so if 1-126 were composed "after the death of Elizabeth, Aston was not too young" to have been Sh.'s friend. The dedication of the 1605 volume hints "that Aston's praises have been written by another in terms which flout decency and good sense," and, accordingly, assumes "a startling significance." As Newdigate depends upon an impossibly late date of composition for 1-126, and as he shows not even a remote possibility that Aston ever patronized Sh., his theory may be ignored.¹ Startling confirmation of it, none the less, was presented by CHARLES STRACHEY (the same, November 16, p. 795)—a pun on Aston's name in the line (86.8), "Giuing him ayde, my verse ASTONished." Charles Best is known, if at all, by a few readers for his mediocre contributions, two in 1608 and eight more in 1611, to the *Poetical Rhapsody*. BARBARA NICKALLS (*T. L. S.*, September 13, 1934, p. 620) presented his name, saying that he was admitted to the Middle Temple in April, 1592, and was mentioned in its records as late as 1627. Essex, she declares, was his patron, and Sh.'s "interest in Essex is well known." The word *best* occurs fifteen (*sic* for twenty-three) times in the sonnets, often—as in 37, 43, 115—in puns. Accordingly,

women who died in January and November, 1621. They are copied on pp. 17 and 19. Sh.'s one sonnet is on p. 96.

¹ In *Michael Drayton and His Circle*, 1941, he himself has abandoned it. Now (p. ix) "without conviction" he outlines the arguments for Drayton as the rival, concluding, "If he be so, then his young patron, Walter Aston, . . . must be the 'lovely boy.' . . . The case for Aston is as strong, I think, as for either Southampton or William Herbert, but that is not saying much." He gives Aston's birthday (p. 146) as July 9, 1583.

Nickalls claims to have made out "a strong case" for her favorite; but to most people it will seem as weak as a jelly-fish.

A brand-new solution of the mystery was furnished in 1936 by ULRIC NISBET (*Onlie Begetter*); namely, that Mr. W. H. was WILLIAM HERBERT or HARBERT (1573-1656), the son of Sir Edward Herbert, of Red Castle, Montgomeryshire, the grandson of William Herbert, first Earl of Pembroke, and the cousin of William Herbert, the third earl. Nisbet argues that he (not the William Herbert, or Harbert, favored by the *D. N. B.*) was also the author of *A Prophecie of Cadwallader*, 1604. To "William Harbert of the Red Castle" Nicholas Breton dedicated his *Wits Trenchmour*, 1597, and by tortuous reasoning Nisbet draws large conclusions. In the dedication Breton uses the proverb, "to make a large gate of [*really* to] a little Towne," while the author of *Cadwallader* (ed. Grosart, 1870, p. 30) writes, "Least that my gates be wider then my towne." This repetition, we are assured (p. 26), is "proof positive that William Harbert of Red Castle was the long forgotten author of 'Cadwallader.'"¹ By similar illogical processes Sh. is said (pp. 32 f.) to allude in 82 to Breton's dedication of his own book to Mr. W. H. Harbert was knighted in 1603 (but [p. 43] he might properly be called "Mr." because he was not "an Earl, or the son of an Earl"), and in 1629 he became the first Lord Powys (*sic*).² "Four [other] slender arguments" in favor of his authorship of *Cadwallader* were presented by BRETT-JAMES (*T. L. S.*, June 19, 1937, p. 464), though in the preceding week (the same, June 12, p. 447) T. W. BALDWIN had adequately refuted Nisbet's plea for this authorship and had shown how undependable was his chain of argument and assertion. Although Herbert of Red Castle may be dismissed from consideration, fairness demands the statement that his claims to the only begettership are hardly more unsupported than those of certain better-known claimants.

A remarkably fantastic notion was advanced in 1939 by WILLIAM ROSS (*Story of Anne Whateley and William Shaxpere*); namely, that Q was composed by Anne Whateley, a nun whom Sh. had jilted in 1582 to marry Anne Hathaway, the dark woman.³ "Shaxpere" (p. 122) was the only begetter of her sonnets because he was her "lover and consort in their spiritual union." When Whateley decided to print her lyrics, a "policy of concealment" prevented their being dedicated to "Mr. W. S." Hence she substituted "the second letter of 'Shaxpere' . . . for the initial letter of the name. By a singular coincidence, 'W' and 'H' happen to be the surname initials of the two women concerned with Shaxpere in the story told by the sonnets. The initials, therefore, represent all three, and no better selection was possible." T. T., for a wonder, remains Thorpe, who addressed Shaxpere in lines "inspired by the

¹ Compare Robert Baron, *An Apology for Paris*, 1649, sig. D6^v, "I will not make *Minda's* large gates to my little City, nor dwell long upon a Proem."

² See *Complete Peerage*, 1895, VI, 295, for this first Baron Powis (*sic*), of Powis (or Poole or Red) Castle. Our hero was made a K. B. in July, 1603.

³ Compare IVOR BROWN and GEORGE FEARON (*The Sh.s.*, 1939, p. 18): "The professors who dismiss her [Anne Whateley] from existence with a contemptuous flick of the fingers may be doing the poor girl a serious injustice. Let us call her the first of the Shakespearean Dark Ladies."

author." While applauding its originality, I regret my inability to believe in this passing "singular coincidence."¹

For news of a further singularity I am indebted to W. C. CURRY. COLONEL the HONOURABLE R. A. CROUCH, of Melbourne, Australia, it appears, has an unpublished article in which he argues that WILLIAM HARRISON (1534-1593), the historian and contributor to Holinshed's *Chronicles*, 1577, 1587, was Sh.'s friend W. H. Crouch dates the sonnets 1586 or 1587, at which time the poet was about twenty-three, the historian about fifty-three. "It is evident," he says, "that they were written by a young man to one much his senior with whom he had vowed mutual, eternal, and inseparable affection."

All too frequently (see pp. 157-165, above) the friend has been explained as, not a man (or a woman), but an ABSTRACT IDEA. "It is not unlikely," BIRCH (*Inquiry*, 1848, p. 1) says, "that the fictitious Unknown, to whom Shakspeare addresses his Sonnets, was intended to represent the world to whom he prophesied of himself—of the oblivion of his life, and fate of his works." Apparently Birch (p. 540) considered Mr. W. H. and the "fictitious Unknown" one personage. "Celestial wisdom," CONSTANCE HOPE (*Month*, 1899, XCIV, 37) explains, "appears to Shakespeare in the guise of one embodying all manly as well as all womanly excellence, an adumbration . . . of humanity in its highest, most God-like aspect." So in 20 Sh. "sings of his mistress, the lord of his love." "Mr. W. H. represents" to DOWNING (*Sh. as Pan-Judge*, 1913, p. 17) "Shakspeare's Spirit, yet he need not represent also the Universal Spirit, but only his own Spirit, alike inspired by the Ideal of Beauty, Truth and Love, and so at one with Shakspeare's." ORD (*Chaucer & the Rival Poet*, 1921, pp. 29, 33-36) tells us that "Cupid in many cases is the 'love' about which Shakespeare is writing," thus turning the sweet boy into the pagan god of love. But to "TOUCHSTONE" (*Saturday Review*, 1922, CXXXIV, 60; 1923, CXXXV, 50) the friend is philosophy—"philosophy of a more virile type than that represented by Chapman's chaste and ideal mistress" and talked of by Acheson.

People who think "Sh." a pseudonym have manifested a diversity of opinion equalling that of the orthodox. Some of them have already been mentioned,² but a few other specimens may prove diverting. T. W. WHITE (*Our English Homer*, 1892, pp. 271 f.), for instance, explains the dedication as meaning that the sonnets, "formerly ascribed to Shakespeare, are the sole product of Mr. W. H. [or ANTHONY BACON]. . . . Unless he be the author, he has no connection with them. . . . [Thorpe's words] may, however, imply more than actual composer. It seems to suggest that he wrote some of them himself and was the cause of others being written by different persons. . . . It is obvious they were not all written by the same individual." But JOSEPH BROWN (*Baconiana*, January, 1905, p. 68), arguing for Bacon as the author, calls "the begetter of the first 26 [for 126?] Sonnets . . . young Cavendish, who afterwards became Baron Hardwick and Duke [really Earl] of Devonshire." F. C. HUNT (*New Shakespeareana*, 1903, II, 20) quotes an unnamed investigator who, after years of study, was convinced that "the person or object addressed . . . under varied

¹ On p. 12 Ross says, "'Mr. W. H.' was Shaxpere." He dates the sonnets (pp. 153 f.) from November, 1581, to 1584.

² See also pp. 44-46, above.

terms of endearment, is [BACON] himself personalized in his genius or spirit, and figured by the character of the Greek god Cupid." This idea is widespread among Baconians, like SMEDLEY (*Baconiana*, January, 1912, pp. 9-17) and PARKER WOODWARD (the same, pp. 17-23).¹ Another, JOHN HUTCHINSON (*Sonnets of "Sh.,"* part I, 1912, pp. 4 f., a reprint from *Baconiana*, April, 1912), takes pains to say that *I, me, thou, you* "represent one and the same personality," Bacon. RICE (*Story of Hamlet*, 1924, pp. 379 f.), however, deserts the fold to tell that Bacon's dear love was SIDNEY (died 1586). But all these are tame indeed beside the discovery of ARENSBERG (*Shakespearean Mystery*, 1928, p. 229) that the sonnets, like *Venus*, are concerned "with the love of mother and son." He analyzes "Mr. W. H." as "a cryptographic form for MOTHER HUS (Greek for *swine*). MR. = MOTHER. . . W. H. may be represented as U'S. H. and anagrammatised as *HUS*," which leads him direct to the author Bacon. Totally different results were obtained by H. SEYMOUR (*Baconiana*, December, 1929, pp. 106-115). From some hocus-pocus with the "precisely 111 letters on the title-page," he gets this highly plausible message from the author: "T. T. is onlie a letter keie for T. H. Mr. W. H. is George Sandys. F. B[acon].," and this new cipher is deciphered, with the help of "the Rosicrucian Seal of 287" and "the Trimethius Cypher," into further evidence of Bacon's authorship. Additional proof, which I spare the reader, is obtained through the manipulation of "FINIS" at the end of the sonnets (sig. K1).

Equally ingenious was the announcement of W. D. O'CONNOR (*Hamlet's Note-Book*, 1886, p. 52) that W. H., "the author" of the sonnets, is "WALTER RALEIGH" and the well-wishing adventurer "the mathematician Hariot,—THOMAS HARIOT, his friend and companion, allowed free access to him during his imprisonment in the Tower." Probably Thorpe never dreamed that he himself would be so expeditiously removed from all connection with the dedication. PALK (*T. L. S.*, April 20, 1916, p. 189), another who believes "Sh." to have been Raleigh, identifies the lovely boy as PRINCE HENRY, the patron to whom Chapman, the rival poet, had dedicated his twelve books of the *Iliad*. Completely unabashed by the facts that the prince was born on February 19, 1594, and Chapman's volume first published in 1609 or 1610, PALK (*Saturday Review*, 1922, CXXXIII, 548) gave further support to his thesis by saying that for some time after his birth Henry was believed to be a girl, as is told in 20.9-12. Queerly enough, nobody seems yet to have found that Henry was the son of Queen Anne by Raleigh or Bacon or Oxford. Such proof may be expected at a not too distant date.

Meanwhile, STOTSENBURG (*Baconiana*, October, 1892, pp. 53-61), who considered Sidney the real author of the sonnets, had announced that SIR EDWARD DYER was the poet's friend. In 20.7 (p. 56) Sidney puns on his name, "likening him to a dyer who occupies himself in colors and who, in his business of dyeing, controls and fixes all hues or colors."² W. THEOBALD (*On the Author-*

¹ Compare L. F. BOSTELMANN (*Rutland*, 1911, p. 12): in the sonnets Rutland "apostrophized his 'genius' as a lovely and beautiful youth."

² He seems to have overlooked the further "proof" in 111.7, "like the Dyers hand," where the capital might be considered significant. See p. 46, above.

ship of the Sonnets, 1896), converted by this evidence—"it cannot reasonably be questioned," he says (p. 16)—pointed out (p. 19) that "Dyer was fourteen years older than Sidney; but what are years in the case of so passionate a bond?" Besides, in 104.1 Sidney testifies, "you neuer can be old." Further details were added by STOTSENBURG in 1904 (*Impartial Study*, pp. 234-236), as that Sidney "advises his friend Dyer to marry" because the latter was "deeply enamored of the wanton Lady Rich."

In 1930 PERCY ALLEN (*Case for Edward de Vere*, pp. 142, 152), who believed W. H. to be the obtainer Hall, of Hackney (see p. 218, above), identified the friend as the author Oxford's son, HENRY DE VERE (born February 24, 1593), by his second wife. ALLEN's opinions shift like quicksilver; and by 1934 (*Anne Cecil*, pp. 22 f.) he had decided that Oxford's son (probably born in 1574) by Queen Elizabeth is the fair youth of the sonnets. In 33 (pp. 72-74, 263) he is described as the "Sunne," his mother as "the region cloud" ("i. e. regina, the queen"). "A great many Shakespeare scholars," L. P. BÉNÉZET (*Shakspeare*, 1937, p. 25) informs us, "are now convinced that Oxford's illegitimate son . . . [was] the fair youth of the sonnets," and that he called himself Sh. But this youth (compare p. 276, below) turns out to have been seventeen in 1582. C. W. BARRELL, in a series of articles in the *Sh. Fellowship Newsletter*, 1941, 1942, volumes III, IV, likewise finds two young men in the sonnets: Southampton and Oxford's bastard son, born March, 1581, by Anne Vavasour. The existence of this son, he boasts (III, 30), truly enough, "has never been known to historians and genealogists." It would appear that Oxford for a considerable number of years practised the lessons he preached in 1-17.

Wonderful indeed is Sh. and even more wonderful are the mental processes of his critics. It is delightfully refreshing to turn from these demonstrations of the impossible to the World-War veteran Colin March, who (in C. E. MONTAGUE's diverting *Fiery Particles*, 1923, pp. 82-86) found in 86.1-3 "the twelve salient letters" spelling "Hohenzollern," and in 27.1-5 and 20.1-5 Sh.'s prophetic warnings, "'Ware Hohenzollerns!" In 135.1 f. Sh. names specifically the KAISER, and in line 14, "Thinke all but one, and me in that one *Will*," plainly hints his inner meaning: "'Will' is the key; find who 'Will' is and you'll find what I'm at." Hence in the dedication Sh. indulges in "obviously ironical good wishes for such immortality as the William Hohenzollern of the 'insuing sonnets' was likely to get when once their riddle was read."

AGNOSTIC VIEWS

Not everybody who admits or emphasizes the physical existence of Mr. W. H. or the friend has insisted on giving him (or them) a name. Long ago ESCHENBURG (*Ueber W. Sh.*, 1787, p. 574) was content to say, "Who this friend was cannot be definitely ascertained." In the midst of continuous special pleading for Southampton, Pembroke, and the rest, agnostics have held their ground from BOSWELL (ed. 1821) to date. A considerable number of demanders of facts, not assumptions, like KNIGHT (ed. 1841), STAUNTON (ed. 1860), and DOWDEN (ed. 1881), have already been mentioned, but a few additional details may be comforting. COLLIER (ed. 1843, pp. 472 f.), frowning

on all the men proposed up to that time, had described the friend's identity as a matter "of comparatively little importance, and it is certainly one upon which we are not likely to arrive at a final and satisfactory decision." "No one knows precisely" who the friend was, declared FLATHE (*Shakspeare*, 1863, I, i, 14 f.), whether Southampton, Pembroke, or someone else: the decision may well be left to the anecdote mongers, for esthetically it matters little what the man's name was. In England FURNIVALL (ed. 1877, p. lxiii) and in Holland BURGERSDIJK (*Sh.'s Sonnetten*, 1879, pp. 168-172) rejected all the candidates; while in America WHITE (ed. 1883, p. 847) asserted, "No theory on this subject has ever been proposed that will bear even a brief critical investigation."

For a time the adherents of Pembroke or Southampton swept the majority of scholars and critics into their ranks, but skeptics and agnostics never ceased to raise a clamor. SECCOMBE and ALLEN (*Age of Sh.*, 1903, I, 26 f.) had read "absolutely nothing" to throw any light on W. H.; if *begetter* "refers simply to the person who got (begot) the sonnets for Thorpe, then it is of no importance what that person's name was. . . . If 'begetter' means inspirer, then, whoever W. H. was, Thorpe is convicted of a gross inaccuracy. . . . The theories on the subject are a mere mass of assumption and guessing." BEECHING decided (ed. 1904, p. xxxi) that the friend "was a person known in society, of good birth and fortune," but nothing in the sonnets indicates "that he belonged to the nobility." RALEIGH (*Shakespeare*, 1907, p. 91) admitted, "It would help us but little to know the names of the beautiful youth and the dark woman." Similar opinions were held by LUCE (*Handbook*, 1906, pp. 90 f.), WALSH (ed. 1908, pp. 16-21), and JUSSELAND (*Literary History*, 1909, III, 227-233). The last observed that the sonnets describe the friend as one who "had no chance of perpetuating his memory, save by his 'sweet form' and rose-like beauty transmitted to his children and celebrated by Shakespeare: strange prognostics if he had really been a future Pembroke or an actual Southampton." It is probable that he "was neither a lord nor a personage of note." MACKAIL (*Lectures*, 1911, p. 190), though satisfied that "W. H. either was, or was understood to be, the boy of the Sonnets himself,"¹ rendered the verdict that "the boy . . . is unidentified, and unidentifiable." WOLFF, later to arrive at a more extreme position, in 1907 (*Shakespeare*, I, 288 f.) termed all identifications of W. H. unsatisfactory. He thought it likely that Thorpe, feeling a dedication to be necessary and yet not knowing Sh. well enough to be acquainted with the original recipient of the sonnets, chose the initials arbitrarily. But a solution of the riddle is futile "because the poet had nothing to do with the dedication."

MASEFIELD (*William Sh.*, 1911, p. 246), PORTER (ed. 1912, p. xxii), NEILSON and THORNDIKE (*Facts*, 1913, pp. 47 f.), and ROEDDER (*Sh.'s Sonette*, 1913, pp. 17-20) insisted that nobody knows who the friend was. POOLER (ed. 1918, p. xxxvi), "without shame or regret," declined to accept or supply his name. LANDAUER (*Shakespeare*, 1920, II, 321-325) decided that Thorpe's dedication may have been intentionally mystifying, and that the initials W. H. need not have any connection with the real name of the begetter. Nothing can be "proved" except that the sonnets are addressed to a nobleman called

¹ But see pp. 178-180, above.

Will. REED's well-expressed view (ed. 1923, p. 79) was: "Shakespeare must have had many friends whose very names, to say nothing of initials, Time has effaced. All that can be said with certainty of the hero of these sonnets is that he was a youth of better birth and fortune than Shakespeare and that his encouragement and friendship, at a certain period in the poet's career, won Shakespeare's praise and devotion. In his gratitude, Shakespeare, as he said, built in these sonnets an enduring monument; unfortunately for us T. T. wrote its inscription." ADAMS (*Life*, 1923, pp. 175, 180 f.) admitted that the friend is unknown, except for his Christian name Will: "he seems to have been of high birth, but without a great title of nobility, possibly without any title at all—the younger son, we may suppose, of a distinguished house, living in one of the Inns of Court, and devoting his time, as did so many young gallants, to the theatres and men of letters"; "perhaps, since the *Sonnets* were designed by the poet primarily as literature, it is just as well that we do not know more." Thorpe was so anxious to conceal the name of W. H., EDUARD SIEVERS (*Anglica*, 1925, II, 206 n.) contributed, "that he did not even once *think* while writing: one must pronounce *double u ache* if one does not wish to break the speech curve and occasion vocal hindrances." Sound-analysis, therefore, is of no help to investigation. LARBAUD (Sh.'s *Sonnets*, 1927, pp. i, x f.) almost cynically declared, "Only that reader can understand the sonnets . . . who is ignorant of the Shakespearean problem or, knowing it, recognizes its folly," and goes on to say, "Neither in the sonnets nor in any known document is there any proof in favor of one or the other of these two [Pembroke and Southampton] theories, and one is astonished to see that they have been able to exist so long a time on so frail a foundation as the imagination and faith of the critics who gave them birth." Similarly GILLET (*Shakespeare*, 1931, p. 127) impatiently wrote that Thorpe's "few lines of gibberish have accounted for more commentaries than the *Apocalypse*." "Why," he asked, "should we know the name of the peddler who procured the copy in order to sell it to a publisher who laughed at instead of paid him?" PARROTT (*William Sh.*, 1934, p. 193) intimated that it is "wiser to renounce any attempt at identification," and to think of the friend "simply as a charming young gentleman of good birth." Such self-restraint, which has been exercised by RIDLEY (ed. 1934, pp. viii-x), KITTREDGE (ed. 1936, p. 1491), SPENCER (*Art and Life*, 1940, p. 32), and various others, seems to me commendable.

THE QUESTION OF HOMOSEXUALITY

Regardless of who the friend was—whether Mr. W. H. or not—the expressions Sh. uses about him have aroused great discussion and concern.¹ MALONE in 1790 (see 32.4 n.) thought it necessary to explain that in the Elizabethan period men often addressed one another in loving terms which to the Georgians sounded indecorous, and COLERIDGE in 1803, writing a note (see I, 55) for the future edification of his son Hartley (Raysor, *Coleridge's Miscellaneous Criticism*, 1936, p. 455), declared that in all Sh.'s work there is "not

¹ Some readers may get light on this matter from EMPSON (*Tokyo Studies in English Literature*, 1933, XIII, 453): "The root of the ambivalence, think, is that W. H. is loved as an arriviste."

even an allusion to that very worst of all possible vices," and defended his "pure love" for the young man of the sonnets. Subsequent editors developed MALONE's vein. Said DYCE (ed. 1832, p. lxxiii): "It was then not uncommon for one man to write verses to another in a strain of such tender affection, as fully warrants our terming them *amatory*." But not all readers were convinced by such explanations. As one illustration, DE WAILLY (*Revue des deux mondes*, 1834, 3d series, IV, 688) exclaims: "Good heavens! What do I notice in rereading some of the first sonnets? He instead of she? Nearly all are in direct discourse: you and thee. Can I be mistaken? Can these sonnets be addressed to a man? Shakspeare! Great Shakspeare! Did you feel yourself authorized by Virgil's example?" In contrast, the author of "The Confessions of William Sh." (*New Monthly Magazine*, 1835, XLIII, 310) asserted that "nothing can be conceived finer, and more full of a noble purpose, than the alliance of Shakspeare with this [unknown] youth"; but he seems to be protesting to keep up his own courage.

GRILLPARZER's opinion, August, 1861 (*Tagebücher*, 1930, VI, 53) was: "To vindicate Shakspeare, since a great part of his sonnets are addressed to a *male* person, the interpreters adduce from his dramas many passages in which the word 'lover' is used by man to man for 'friend,' 'favorite,' 'devotee.' But in all these instances *beauty* is never the cause of the affection." This dark suspicion continued to spread, no doubt all the more rapidly because of the unceasing apologies for Sh.'s good name in all countries where the sonnets were read. Thus BEKK (*William Sh.*, 1864, pp. 54 f.; *Shakspeare*, 1902, pp. 84 f.) explained that it is not Sh., but the poet's muse, who loves the friend (Southampton), and hence that the love is "purely and ideally poetic." E. W. SIEVERS (*William Sh.*, 1866, p. 104) went out of his way to urge that when Sh. wrote the sonnets "he *believed* in" his friend (Southampton), "and thus his love for him actually acquired a religious significance and was *sacred*." Similarly CONRAD (*Archiv*, 1879, LXII, 16 f.) spoke of "our moral duty" to show that the sonnets have nothing corresponding to the "loathsome, sensual degeneracy of love among friends that antiquity unfortunately knew." Rather "in the sonnets of friendship Shakspeare reveals himself to us as a Platonist in the best sense of the word"; into them he "put his noblest feelings, his profoundest thoughts about the universe and man," out of affection for his friend and for his profit. Sh. conceives of friendship with an ideality "of which the literature of the world has perhaps but a *single* other example: the second discourse of Socrates in *Phaedrus*." To this explanation CONRAD returned in 1882 (*Jahrbuch*, XVII, 190): "The simplest, most honorable, *only possible* explanation of the *procreation sonnets* . . . lies in Shakspeare's Platonism." Such had been the thesis of RICHARD SIMPSON in 1868 (see pp. 157 f., above), and it was also stressed by VON DANCKELMAN (*Sh. in seinen Sonetten*, 1897, pp. 21-23), SANFELICE (*Rivista d'Italia*, 1898, III, 288-290), F. T. VISCHER (*Sh.-Vorträge*, 1899, I, 135), and many others.

But uneasiness persisted. KRAUSS (*Nord und Süd*, 1879, VIII, 232 f., 239) discussed the subject in roundabout terms, only to be rebuked by MAX KOCH (*E. S.*, 1883, VI, 247): "Krauss need not fear for Shakspeare the old reproach of pederasty, for it is impossible according to the text of the sonnets." Besides, "in a large number of sonnets the poet urges a greatly revered young man to

marry. This prosaic fact suffices to remove support from under all suspicions." Yet in the same year FILON (*Histoire de la littérature anglaise*, 1883, p. 187) had luridly described how Sh. led his friend to a dearly loved courtesan, and "the young gentleman supplanted the poet." The story is old, its conclusion new; since "for reasons which Anacreon might perhaps have been able to explain, . . . Shakespeare preferred his friend to his mistress." WILDE (*Blackwood's*, 1889, CXLVI, 13) perhaps did not improve matters by explaining that the children Sh. begs Willie Hughes "to beget are no children of flesh and blood, but more immortal children of undying fame. The whole cycle of the early sonnets is simply Shakespeare's invitation to Willie Hughes to go upon the stage and become a player." Yet in his enlarged *Portrait of Mr W. H.* (1921 ed., pp. 60-68) WILDE stressed Sh.'s Platonic conception of love, and categorically denied anything "unlawful" in it. The sonnets, he said, need no defense, an idea stressed also by OLIVIERI (Sh.'s *Sonetti*, 1890, pp. xxxiv-xxxvi) with citations from the language of love used by Poliziano, Martelli, Bembo, and Michelangelo. H. M. STANLEY (*Essays*, 1897, p. 4), however, believed them to "celebrate a love . . . dubious in its character," and THOMAS NEAL (*Marzocco*, December 19, 1897, p. 3) admitted that such a "forbidden love" needs thick veils to conceal it.

BUTLER's assertions (ed. 1899) that the friend (Hewes) "lured" Sh. "disastrously" into "sin" (p. 70), that the sonnets suffer "from a leprous or cancerous taint" and tell "a very squalid" story (p. 86), and that the love of the two men was (p. 122), "though only for a short time, more Greek than English" brought the suspicion of Sh.'s homosexuality again into the open. Though ROBERT BRIDGES wrote to him on December 31, 1899 (H. F. Jones, *Samuel Butler*, 1919, II, 314 f.), urging that the poet felt for Mr. W. H. "ideal love . . . heightened by dissociation from sex," BUTLER maintained (the same, II, 318) that Sh. "had been lured . . . by a comely, heartless youth who was amusing himself." Years later LARBAUD (Sh.'s *Sonnets*, 1927) ridiculed Butler's work. Admitting (pp. xiv f.) that it would be just as easy to argue that the majority of the sonnets are "visibly pederastic in inspiration" as that they are autobiographical or dramatic, he takes Butler to task (pp. xxiv f.) for believing "that the Great National Poet was on the verge of having what is conveniently called bad morals! To suggest the word 'pederasty' with reference to so pure a glory! And yet obviously this is what forced him to publish this book. . . . Timidity; precautions: Shakespeare was so young when he committed this fault; have pity on him! . . . The man capable of writing the sonnets to the dark woman was not a pervert."

Henceforth, Sh.'s moral reputation was alternately blackened and white-washed. WALSH (ed. 1908, p. 26), to be sure, tried to dismiss the matter by the bald statement that "if anything improper, in the Greek style, is to be found in the sonnets, it must first be put there from without." But in the very next year JUSSELAND (*Literary History*, 1909, III, 237) manifested uneasiness over these poems from which "something morbid exhales"; they reveal "an unconscious and involuntary platonism . . . which, for all that it rose as high as the clouds, none the less struck its roots beneath the miry earth." CONRAD (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, 1914, CLVI, 470) reproved him for accusing Sh. of a nauseating habit. If Jusserand knows the sonnets, Conrad

remarks, "he must know that in the first seventeen the poet exhorts the youth to *marry*: would a homosexual do that?" Hence nothing can be found in these splendid poems to indicate that perverted love, which Jusserand invents. Such, too, was the belief of VALLENTIN (*Zeitschrift für Aesthetik und . . . Kunstwissenschaft*, 1910, V, 267), though it is expressed in sensational phraseology: "The poet's power and the beauty of the . . . [friend] dissolve into 'higher coition,' perform the great consummation of poetic love. Eros is the entire muse, the muse is entire Eros." But according to ALBERT MOLL's *Berühmte Homosexuelle (Grenzfragen des Nerven- und Seelenlebens*, 1910, XI, no. 75, 38 f.), "one can scarcely deny the erotic nature of the sonnets." The conventions of the day and the cult of friendship have been stressed with the idea of freeing Sh. from the reproach of homosexuality; but 20 alone proves his guilt. No conventions are to be found in that sonnet. Moll then adds, for good measure, that Bacon was accused of the same vice.

Just at this time DE BERZEVICZY (*Revue de Hongrie*, 1914, XIII, 169-183) made an interesting comparison of the sonnets of Sh. and Michelangelo. The latter (p. 182) addressed a few lyrics to a young man, Tommaso de' Cavalieri, Sh. many.¹ We know who the young Italian was but not the young Englishman. In Michelangelo the friendship had nothing but a Platonic, ideal interpretation; on the other hand, Sh. seeks defense against misinterpretation (72, 121). The former's poems are purer and graver; the latter's love is more sensual and humble. Melancholy dominates both poets, and they seek solace in their lyrics. HANS KLIEM (*Sentimentale Freundschaft*, 1915, pp. 25 f.) also tried to dam the torrent of scandal by emphasizing the parallel treatment of friendship in Sh.'s sonnets and in Sir Thomas Browne's *Religio Medici*: both men gave expression to the enthusiastic ideas of a spiritual friendship, purified from all profane accompaniments—Sh. by eulogizing his friend with the highest ardor, Browne by a philosophical investigation of the qualities of friendship. H. O. TAYLOR (*Thought and Expression*, 1920, II, 253) may have sympathized with Kliem, for he asserts that Sh. "not only understood, but felt, perhaps the most complete and extreme affection of one man for another ever revealed in literature."

More entertaining than any of these is Sh.'s fine self-justification as given by GREGORY THORNTON (*Sonnets of Sh.'s Ghost*, 1920, Sonnet II):

They say a man ne'er bore such love to man,
Or, if he did, 'twere but a cause for shame;
But, speaking so, they their own measure scan,
And blot their censure with self-blaming blame.
For, thou being Beauty's best, the best of me
Worshipp'd but Beauty's self and Beauty's worth;
My fire and air, my spirit, adorèd thee
Unmix'd with gross compounding of my earth.
And thou wert best of Truth, the first in grace
Of all rich gems in Virtue's carcanet;

¹ CHIARINI (*Nuova antologia*, 1890, 3d series, XXVII, 112 f.), however, disputes this analogy, for Sh. praises his friend's physical beauty.

Then should I not love thee and give thee place
 Above all love of sense on woman set?
 In love of Beauty, whate'er shape 'tis in,
 There's nought of Truth, if it must think of sin.

All in vain. As in a post-war era speech grew franker, inhibitions fewer, interest in this unsavory subject increased. MATHEW (*Image of Sh.*, 1922, p. 111) remarks that in 1609 homosexuality "was common at Court and the King himself was accused of it." Be that as it may, he has no warrant for saying: "Thorpe's dedication and Benson's changes are tokens that when the *Sonnets* were printed in 1609 they were interpreted as proofs of that vice."

GUNDOLF's pronouncements (*Shakespeare*, 1928, I, 167 f.) deserve a paragraph to themselves. "The sonnets indicate that Shakespeare's passion was first centered upon a handsome, noble youth, whatever his name. Wherever the formative impulse, the plastic instinct, is powerful, there always bears sway, with more or less clear conscience, the sense of and the feeling for the lovely body, the male body, as the bearer of the soul which seeks to become visible, even as the female body, as the bearer of life which requires substance, excites the procreative instinct. The Renaissance, with its revival of ancient values, once more gave a good conscience and a frank aspect to this impulse, which had never wholly disappeared but had been forbidden and driven under cover by Christianity. It appears in the artistic empire of Italian neo-paganism after the manner of the subterranean rebellions of medieval organizations of men (like the order of the Templars) or of oriental tendencies; sometimes with bold frankness, spiced by the modern sense of wickedness, contrasted with the Christian conscience, existing from the court to the curia, sometimes with a heroic struggle against the feeling of sin as in Michelangelo, sometimes with a gay epicureanism, sometimes with Platonic transfiguration. From Italy it spread over all Europe and gripped with especial power the military and artistic circles. The English theater, because of its Bohemianism and its extra-social 'wantonness,' was susceptible to such pagan currents of the Renaissance; and with reason the spiritual founder of the Elizabethan drama, Marlowe, has been given a bad name as blasphemer and pederast. Most of all, the fact that women's roles were played by young men spread throughout the world of the theater a sensual atmosphere which differentiated it from middle-class inclinations and the family sense of ordered society. In such a realm of extra-social provocations, customs, and ideas, with the mightiest creative impulse of all time, receptive to every kind of beauty, charm, and temptation, Shakespeare, aside from many sensual discharges which willing women granted him, must also have experienced the sensually spiritual tension which the unfulfillable and undischageable love for a beautiful youth excites. His earliest sonnets and his narrative poems are the poetic testimonials of this state of intensity, temptation, swelling, and torment."

Somewhat equivocal is G. W. KNIGHT's explanation (*Holborn Review*, 1929, LXXI, 450 f.): "One can say no more than that Shakespeare had probably at one time experienced a passionate love for some friend. . . . The man who is not, potentially at least, capable of an extreme admiration of young masculine beauty may be many things, but he certainly is not a poet." Entirely unequivocal, flatly outspoken, is THURSTON (*Month*, 1930, CLVI, 434): "We

have grown so accustomed to regard Shakespeare as a classic and to venerate his genius that we have been determined to construe innocently all that might contain ground for offence. But, regretfully as we must say it, the Sonnets in their plain and obvious meaning point to a plague spot which, beginning in the neo-paganism of the Italian renaissance, had by degrees infected the more dissolute and godless among young men of fashion throughout Europe."¹ He says further that the unpopularity of the sonnets in the seventeenth century (of all times!) was due to the widespread knowledge of their corruptness—a highly debatable statement. More condemnatory and graphic still is GILLET (*Shakespeare*, 1931, pp. 134-140): "This dangerous being had all that was necessary to seduce and torment a poet of delicate sensibility, of aristocratic spirit and perhaps a little snobbishness. . . . The simple phenomena of his youth and beauty were a great attraction to the aging man. . . . Shakespeare was lost. . . . Throughout the sonnets one can see the sort of disquieting young dog that . . . [the boy] was: nonchalant, despotic, insolent, probably malicious, falsehood incarnated in the form of an angel. . . . Such was the poet's terrible experience. . . . *My master-mistress* . . . what man ever addressed another man with such self-abasement and such adoration?" Sh., instead of reveling in his sin, confesses and laments it. The sonnet sequence, as a result, is "the most tragic of human documents, the eternal story of mature age seeking to retain youth, of the superior man seized by a creature of luxury that betrays and martyrs him, and that, under its brilliant plumage, is a soulless nature, a vulgar bird."

Sh. had defenders in ARISTIDE MARIE (*A la recherche de Sh.*, 1924, pp. 116 f.), F. C. RANG (*Die Kreatur*, 1926-1927, I, 200-213),² PRAZ (*English Studies*, 1928, X, 24), HELENE RICHTER (*Sh.'s Gestalten*, 1930, p. 9), GROTH (*Beiblatt*, 1930, XLI, 136 f.), TER HAGHE (*Neophilologus*, 1932, XVII, 292), and DOUGLAS. Richter expressed the peculiar notion that nowadays one who defends Sh.'s morality "is considered hypersensitive and pedantic"; while Groth humorlessly tried to prove our sonneteer's comparative innocence on the ground that "since it has recently been established from a London church register that an illegitimate daughter of Shakespeare's was buried on August 8, 1609, the designation of an *unnatural* hater of women does not fit him."³ The

¹ [LANDAU (*Sh.-Mysterium*, 1930, pp. 126 f.) frankly admits that his hero, Rutland *alias* Sh., and Pembroke were homosexual lovers. ROBERT FRAZER (*Silent Sh.*, 1915, p. 104) had earlier made the same admission about Bacon and Southampton. Other anti-Stratfordians have joined in this sport.]

² For Rang friendship is one of the most important things in the world. In its purest form it came into being during the Renaissance, and Sh. was its apostle. Thus friendship was "an outcry from the soul," a delight in the friend's beauty. But it was not a demanding friendship; it made no claims upon the friend, other than that he be there to receive the products of friendship, in this case the sonnets. For there was no union of minds; the friend could not participate in the poet's intellectual achievements. Friendship, in other words, was solitary. The act of being a friend was all-sufficient.

³ This "recent" misinformation Groth must have derived from BRANDL's lecture of March 28, 1922 (*Archiv*, 1923, CXLV, 278). Brandl, in turn, had

daughter thus airily referred to seems never to have been born to Sh. Instead of following her footless trail, Groth could have proved his thesis far more adequately from Sh.'s own words (as in 138.13 f., 151, and 152 and perhaps 134-136); but he nullified his defense by admitting that many of the sonnets bear indications of "psychopathic masochism." From such defenders as Groth may all future poets be delivered.

DOUGLAS (*True History*, 1933), vehemently attempting to whiten his poet-hero's character, reproaches (p. 19) Butler for smearing it with base accusations of homosexuality, and asserts that Wilde not only refrained from such a charge but "in a passage in 'Dorian Gray' by implication definitely rejects it."¹ Whatever his effect on other readers, Douglas failed to convince his reviewer FRANCIS BIRRELL, who wrote (*New Statesman*, 1933, n. s., V, 480): "Such complete absorption in another person of the same sex, whether 'Platonic' or not, seems to me psychologically homosexual." On the other hand E. S. P. HAYNES (*More from a Lawyer's Notebook*, 1933, pp. 155 f.) comments on Butler, Wilde, and Douglas: "None . . . are or were lawyers; but to the legal mind it must necessarily occur that if Shakespeare was indulging in what was at the time a capital offence—sometimes punished at the stake—he would scarcely call attention to it in verse. Even literary vanity has its limits!"

DANNENBERG (*Jahrbuch*, 1934, LXX, 51, 54 f.) perhaps inclined to Birrell's position, and his high-tension account of the friendship is sufficiently alarming. The poet becomes enamored of the boy, but their relationship is not one of physical love; instead it is based on the fact that each knows about the other, that each can say of the other: "He is here!" Later the youth tries to break away from his "male-masculine obligations"; the poet, fearful of losing him, acquiesces. But he cannot ascend the heights except through the friend. When he attempts it, he inevitably falls. After such a downfall he begins the well-known sonnet 57, "which shows him cowering in deepest self-abasement at the feet of the idolized one, drunkenly breathing the bliss of soulless devotion, yearningly near delirium." More poetically still, A. E., or G. W. RUSSELL (*House of the Titans*, 1934, pp. 46-55), makes the dark woman herself tell of Sh.'s love for a boy at court:

I grew sick
Seeing the dawn of an unnatural love,
The kind that marred the Grecian genius.

To save the poet she became mistress to both and "was victor Slaying the unnatural with the natural love," even though she lost Sh. The weighing of pros and cons in ADNÈS's *Sh. et la folie*, 1936 (pp. 288 f.) will not reassure the

garbled an article written by C. R. HAINES (*Quarterly*, 1921, CCXXXVI, 242), who cited Stopes's discovery of the burial at St. Clement's Danes, August 8, 1609, of Jane, daughter of William "Shackspeer." STOPES discussed this matter long ago in *Sh.'s Family*, 1901, p. 148, deciding that William was an error for John Sh., as Haines duly recorded.

¹ According to LUNN (*After Puritanism*, 1929, p. 160), Wilde had said that Sh. "was sexually abnormal, a view which had been privately held for a long time by many persons of abnormal tastes." But see p. 234, above.

faint-hearted. Even more alarming is the appearance in *Sh.'s Revelations* by *Sh.'s Spirit*, 1919, a book of poems dictated (p. 8) through SARAH SHATFORD, "the only medium through whom I, as spirit, have worked at words," of a poem (p. 433) ominously headed "W.S. To PERVERTS: (His own title)." It begins,

O to be loved by a lover again
As once on the earth loved was I.
O to be worshipped as this one did me,
Who worships me still in God's sky.

Here is one "sonnet story" that has a (comparatively) happy ending. After decades of suspicions, innuendos, accusations, Sh.'s reputation and the sweet boy's (assuming him to have been real) are now cleared and refurbished—at least for the present generation. 20 when contrasted with 151 (see the notes) has largely turned the trick. The latter proves that there was nothing abnormal in the poet's attitude towards women—or towards the black woman. The former, GREGOR writes (*Shakespeare*, 1935, pp. 536 f.), shows unmistakably that "the friend possessed many feminine traits"; but as Sh. "ungrudgingly leaves his friend's masculinity to the other sex," investigation of this "ticklish question" should cease here. It did not cease. YOUNG published a whole book on the subject: *The Sonnets of Sh.: A Psycho-Sexual Analysis*, 1937. "No homosexual," he decided (pp. 8 f.), "would ever urge such action" as marriage (13) "upon his love. The terror of his days and nights would be the fear of losing him through the wiles of a wife"; while 20 (p. 11) "simply could not have been written by a homosexual. . . . 'A woman's face' would add no charm in the eyes of a homosexual, and the one thing which nature so carelessly added would not have been to his purpose nothing. It would, so far from defeating him, have been the one thing absolutely essential." One might call it poetic justice that 20, about the most indecent sonnet of the lot, has helped to clear Sh.'s name. All Young's reviewers—like H. T. PRICE (*J. E. G. P.*, 1938, XXXVII, 432)—admit that he has disposed of the charge of irregular sex relations. SPENCER (*Art and Life*, 1940, p. 33) can detect "no hint" of them in any sonnet. One can but hope that future critics will let this particular "problem" stay solved.¹ It belongs to the outworn buried age.

THE FRIEND A FICTION

The subject of homosexuality would never have been discussed in the first place if Sh.'s readers had not been so eager to prove the friend a real man. Various persons, of course, have denied his existence. One of the earliest,

¹ In his recent novel, *Gentleman of Stratford*, 1939, pp. 287 f., JOHN BROPHY explains that Sh. is referring to himself in 144 as "a man right faire" and "The better angell." Sh. foresees the charge of homosexuality, but refuses to amend the poem, because "the notion of confusion and misunderstanding . . . [pleases] his embittered mood." In his notes (pp. 371 f.) Brophy justifies his character's mischievous desire "to confuse readers of the Sonnets, and to cover up incidental disclosures of his private life. Every creative writer who is not a confirmed exhibitionist does this sort of thing on occasion."

DYCE (ed. 1832, p. lxxvi), said it was likely that he "was merely the creature of imagination, and had no more existence than those fair ones, whom various writers have so perseveringly wooed in verse"; most of the sonnets were dramatic, being written "for the amusement, and probably at the suggestion, of the author's intimate associates." In America J. S. HART (*Sartain's Magazine*, 1849, V, 222 f.) welcomed this explanation: the friend, he wrote, is "a mere coinage of the author's brain." Other supporters, in whole or in part, of the fiction or dramatic theory—like MASSEY, KRAUSS, and MACKAY—have been discussed in Appendix VI (pp. 133-165, above). Though he did not belong wholly in their ranks, the Southamptonite LEE added to the weapons at their command by stressing the conventions and commonplaces of the sonnets. He did more or less wave the dark woman aside, thereby helping to destroy belief in the "sonnet story," and he insisted (as in his *French Renaissance*, 1910, pp. 267 f., 270) that Sh.'s "warning that youthful beauty will utterly perish unless it propagate itself, and his impassioned appeals to a highborn patron in the name of friendship, strike a note that is heard in the inner circle of the Pléiade," and that Jodelle "anticipates at almost every turn the tenor of Shakespeare's sonnets."

Lee's arguments, one feels, would be worthier of acceptance if he had developed them to their logical conclusion by pronouncing all the sonnet figures conventional and fictitious. While he temporized, WOLFF (*E. S.*, 1916, XLIX, 172-180) stepped boldly, and learnedly, forward. It is impossible to tell, Wolff asserts, whether all of 1-126 were addressed to a man or whether Sh., following the example of Poliziano, Michelangelo, and Sannazaro, sometimes addressed his mistress in masculine terms. Nor can one be sure that the "Lord" and the friend are identical. In any case, the sonnets contain nothing not earlier said by the Petrarchans. Every poet had to have a patron, and Giovanni della Casa summarizes the relationship: the friendship is one-sided on the poet's part; he must submit to the other's moods and insults; he must obsequiously demean himself, praising the patron's virtues, extenuating his faults. Sh. follows this convention exactly: he acknowledges his duty to the patron (26), calls himself the patron's slave and servant (57, 58), endures the latter's variable moods (33, 34, 120), admits that at any time he may rightly be expelled from favor (49, 89), debases himself (29), speaks of his own unworthiness (49) and his failings (36, 111), laments and tries to excuse his Muse's neglect of the patron (101, 102, 83, 85). The friend's sins are defended, condoned, transmogrified to graces (35, 40, 41, 70, 95). All this agrees with della Casa and was commonplace among Italian sonneteers. Sh.'s love and praise of a man are likewise duplicated by the Italians, especially Sannazaro, Francesco Copetta, and Michelangelo. The Petrarchan poet has a double role of poet-servant and lover. He is always the opposite of his friend. When the latter is young, beautiful, of high rank, popular and unblemished, he himself is old (22, 37, 62, 73), ugly (37, 62, 63), of low birth (37, 89, 111), friendless and unlovable (29, 30, 72, 112), of blemished character (36, 88, 109, 111). Angelo di Costanzo, like Sh., calls his style mean and feeble, and wishes to be silent rather than to destroy his patron's fame. Likewise Tasso describes his song as weak, and declares that true poetry exists only in his beloved. Many people have assumed that Sh. refers to and complains about his profession,

but he is merely using common sonnet properties. Petrarchan lyricism permits no individualistic poet, no individualistic beloved. Both are types. At first the poet in *amor sensuale* stands far below the beloved. Purer emotions raise him to *amor razionale*. Finally he achieves *amor divino*. Sh.'s three years of loving his friend (see the notes to 104) are modest when compared with Alamanni's nine, Bernardo Tasso's ten, Sannazaro's eleven, and Bembo's fifteen.

Wolff's learned essay presents a far better case than Lee's, even if he rides his hobby too hard. Both ignore the fact that a poet (or a freshman writing a love letter) can be thoroughly sincere, can deal with real people, real events, real emotions, even while he is borrowing nearly all his subject-matter. Wolff, at any rate, gives chapter and verse, both of them lacking in the statements of J. J. CHAPMAN (*Glance toward Sh.*, 1922, p. 98) that the sonnets "were almost certainly paid for" by Sh.'s patron, and that 1-17 are "a joke," since "the exchange of absurd sonnets was a social game, lately introduced from France." And as interesting as Wolff's are the views of NOYES, 1924 (*New Essays*, 1927, p. 111): "The somewhat sickly modern talk about Shakespeare's 'lovely friend' and 'beloved' and all the rest of it can be blown to the four winds; . . . just as a melody lingers in the mind, so the music of a young poet, who had been working at great length on 'Venus and Adonis,' was carried on by its own momentum through divergent passages which were sometimes used or completed later."

Whatever the truth may be about the existence or non-existence of the friend, the combined arguments of Lee, Wolff, and Noyes seem to me fully as plausible as any yet presented for a definite individual; and the remark of an anonymous reviewer, "the Cinderella whom the mysterious initials will fit remains still in obscurity," is as applicable to 1942 as to 1855 (*Fraser's Magazine*, LII, 410); for, as ALDEN (*Shakespeare*, 1922, p. 118) phrased it, "simple honesty must confess that nothing worthy of the name of proof has ever been produced in connection with the whole matter." The friend, or W. H., remains unknown. Theories about him are still theories: he may have existed, he may be a fictitious, a conventional, a dramatic figure or figures. In any case, WYNDHAM (ed. 1898, p. 247) was not far wrong in asserting that any attempt to identify the friend of the sonnets must "prove detrimental to an aesthetic appreciation of their lyrical excellence," and NOYES, 1924 (*New Essays*, 1927, p. 103) certainly right in saying that if his identity "were discovered to-morrow, we should be no nearer to the mind of Shakespeare."

APPENDIX IX

THE DARK WOMAN

The dark woman of the sonnets cannot be examined *in vacuo*, but writers on Sh., more than Nature herself, abhor vacuums. She is inextricably bound with the problems of autobiography, date, arrangement, the identity of the friend and, some insist, of the rival poet. Initially more important still is the question: In what sonnets does she appear? For until it is answered one cannot tell what role, actual or fictitious, she played in the lives of the other sonnet figures. If there were agreement that, as MALONE and STEEVENS (ed. 1780, p. 682 n.) believed, 1-126 deal with the male friend and 127-154 "are addressed to a female" or "devoted to a mistress," the problem would be much simplified. As Appendix IV (pp. 74-116, above) shows, this division *has* been widely accepted. Those who assume it to represent Sh.'s own intention may find not implausible such a summary of the action as FURNIVALL's (ed. 1877, p. lxvi): Sh. "had become involv'd in an intrigue with a married woman who threw him over for his friend Will. She was dark, had beautiful eyes, and was a fine musician, but false"; all 127-154 are connected with her except possibly 146, which may be misplaced. Or DOWDEN's (ed. 1881, p. 15): In 127-154 Sh. "addresses a woman to whom it is impossible to pay the conventional homage of sonneteers: he cannot tell her that her cheeks are lilies and roses, her breast is of snow, her heart is chaste and cold as ice. Yet he loves her, and will give her tribute of verse. He praises her precisely as a woman who without beauty is clever and charming, and a coquette, would choose to be praised. True, . . . she is no pink and white goddess; all her imperfections he sees. Yet she can fascinate by some nameless spell; she can turn the heart hot or cold. If she is not beautiful, it is because something more rare and fine takes the place of beauty. She angers her lover; he declares to her face that she is odious, and at the same moment he is at her feet." Or, in scenario style, DANNENBERG's (*Jahrbuch*, 1934, LXX, 64): "Lecherously she allures him; she seems to give herself up to him: he whines like a lost flame [whatever that may mean], now sinking down, now blazing up along her body, entangled in the deliriously flickering word-play of his idolatry."

But vivid imaginations would quickly function to riddle such sketches, even if the Q order were everywhere admitted to be correct. For example, in playful, anti-Petrarchan vein Sh. says (130.7 f.) that "in some perfumes is there more delight, Then in the breath that from my Mistres reekes." To modern ears *reekes* has an unpleasant connotation. Granted; yet peculiar are the ways of commentators. JORDAN (*Sh.'s Gedichte*, 1861, p. 414) announces that Sh. expresses disgust for his mistress's ill-smelling breath. Another German, HESSEN (*Leben Sh.'s*, 1904, pp. 200 f.), adds graphic details: "In 130 we meet suggestions of a kind of realism that is unique in the whole literature of love; and we are reconciled only by the fact that here at least the suspicion . . . of poetic conceits is entirely absent. The 'dark lady' seems to have had an

unpleasant breath." Indeed from *reekes*, an expression applicable to something that smells smoky, she appears to have been one of the first English female addicts to tobacco, which Sh. in his other works mentions nowhere. After this learned disquisition it is a bit anti-climactic to read the brief comment of YOUNG (*Sonnets of Sh.*, 1937, p. 31), "her breath reeks of garlic or sack." But JORDAN (pp. 413-415) has other details not to be neglected. 130 tells that the woman's breasts are "dun," or dark brown; that her hairs are "wiers," or twisting, curling; that she "treads on the ground," or has flat feet. Was she not a mulatto or quadroon?¹ Very likely "she was a married woman . . . from the West Indian colonies, of creole descent with an admixture of African blood"—a conjecture supported by her "hot-blooded coquetry" and her musical talent. Jordan then points out in *Othello* parallels which also refer to Sh.'s miscegenetic love affair. FINCH BARNARD (*Science and the Soul*, 1918, pp. 17 f.), too, is certain that "Sonnet 130 describes a negress," but since in 131 "the Author [who is not Sh.] contradicts himself," the woman may only "have been dark, perhaps a Creole type, and probably young." If damaging "facts" like these had not escaped the attention of most later writers, would so many have hastened to identify the poet's mistress with the beauteous majesty of England or one of her ladies?

Even those, then, who agree that the dark woman appears in 127-154 disagree in their interpretation of her. But not everybody replies in the same way to the question: What sonnets are addressed to, or concern, the woman? The answers are legion. In 1640 BENSON's edition implied that all, or nearly all, were in one way or another associated with her, and it is significant that in three seventeenth-century manuscripts (BROOKE, ed. 1936, pp. 66 f.) 2 is entitled "To One That Would Die a Maid" and in a fourth manuscript (see the introduction to 2) "A Lover to his Mistres." LINTOTT advertised his edition in the *Post Boy*, February 24-27, 1711 (*N. & Q.*, August 19, 1922, p. 145), as containing sonnets that Sh. "wrote in Praise of one of his Mistresses"; but happily on the title-page of the book he reduced this promiscuity—"One Hundred and Fifty Four Sonnets, all of them in Praise of his Mistress." SEWELL (ed. 1725, Preface, p. ix) shared this impression; and GEORGE CHALMERS (*Supplemental Apology*, 1799, pp. 91, 97) referred approvingly to Lintott (whom he confused with Gildon): "Gildon republished these Sonnets, in 1710, which, he asserted, 'to be *all of them in praise of his mistress*;' as the editor adds in his Title-page," "Does not Mr. Gildon, with *probability*, for his support, assert, that the Sonnets were addressed to the poet's *mistress*?" The pseudonymous American DAVID DIARY in 1806 (*Port Folio*, n. s., I, 385-389) explained that most of 1-17, the so-called "procreation sonnets" (among them 9, which has the line, "The world wilbe thy widdow") were "addressed to Rose," Sh.'s mistress, the "fair auditor," who is urged to marry and have a child "as the pledge of her youthful beauty,"² all this urgency being an attack

¹ No doubt this could explain why Sh.'s eyes didn't love the dark woman, and why (141.1 f.) they in her "a thousand errors" noted.

² In 1937 DODD (*Sh. Creator of Freemasonry*, pp. 190 f.) said of 1-17: "The poet's use of one word [*treasure* in 2.6] proves quite conclusively that they were not addressed to a man at all but to a woman." Readers interested in the matter should look up for themselves his comments.

on the Romish doctrine of celibacy. Y. J. (*New Monthly Magazine*, 1823, VII, 474 f.) likewise had no suspicion that the opening sonnets were written for a man. Instead, Sh. "woos his mistress constantly by representing how miserable it is for beauty to be childless, and rings the changes upon this theme through fifty sonnets." Like Benson, Lintott, and Sewell, Y. J. took it for granted that, "if sonnets were to be written at all, in those days, they must have been addressed to some mistress," and he asserted categorically that all one hundred fifty-four run upon the love of a woman. Not much different was COLERIDGE's notion (see p. 136, above). On the other hand, DRAKE (*Sh. and His Times*, 1817, II, 58-72), while finding it necessary to argue at length that 1-126 had a man for their subject,¹ had denied that all of 127-154 deal with a woman, asserting that 129 and 146 concern no individual and that four others "have no very determinate application."

ANNA JAMESON (*Memoirs of the Loves of the Poets*, 1829 [1833, I, 209-214]) writes with less interest than one would expect of this "veiled and . . . nameless phantom," who turns up before 127 in 71, 90, 93, 95-97, 99, 105, 119, and for whose favors the rival of 80 and 83 strove. The sentimental author of "The Confessions of William Sh." (*New Monthly Magazine*, 1835, XLIV, 327-336) assures us that "a passion more remarkable in all respects was never, perhaps, felt by any heart" than Sh.'s for the unknown woman "veiled and nameless as she is"; that to her were addressed in the first series, among others, 17, 33-35, 43, 49, 58, 70, 75, 87, 92, 93, 95, 97-99, 105; and that she played Sh. false not only with the friend but with the rival poet of 80, 83, and 86. As referring to a woman EMERSON (*Nature*, 1836, p. 66) enumerated 52, 70, 98, 123, 124, and KREYSSIG (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, 1864, XIV, 98-102) 21, 40-42, 75, 99, 117-120. J. F. OTIS (*Southern Literary Messenger*, 1838, IV, 130) quoted 30 and 54, in which Sh. "is addressing an imaginary mistress, the eidolon of nearly all his sonnetizing," and DONNELLY (*Sonnets of Sh.*, 1859, p. 6) declared that "the greater part . . . are evidently addressed to a female." In 1862 ZIMMERMANN (*Studien*, 1870, II, 115) was certain that among the sonnets often said to be directed to Southampton "are others, and their number is not small," which can be explained only as addressed to a beloved woman; while the French critic TAINÉ (*History of English Literature* [1863], 1871, I, 300-302) discovered out of her usual haunts—in 95, 98, 99—the female phantom, "a sort of Marion Delorme"² for whom Sh. had "a miserable blind despotic passion." DEVRIENT (*Zwei Sh.-Vorträge*, 1869, p. 30) was convinced that the sonnets were by no means addressed to one person, only in the smallest degree to a man or a boy, but preponderantly to a woman.³ Hence he fre-

¹ See his explicit statement at II, 69. At II, 50 f., he had said that a woman is addressed in 32 and 37.

² Hence CHARLOTTE F. WILDER (*Methodist Review*, 1909, XCI, 378), who knew Taine better than De Vigny or Victor Hugo, told her readers that the dark woman is "said to have been Marion Delorme, a French courtesan."

³ Writers of fiction have had much to say on this subject. As one illustration, EMILY M. SYMONDS (*Study in Prejudices*, 1895, pp. 2 f.) presents a painter who believed that Sh. "loved a woman called Rose, and that she was not the dark-eyed, false-hearted heroine of the later sonnets, but the original from

quently translates *friend* or *love* as *Freundin*. With more assurance still CONRAD (*Archiv*, 1879, LXII, 156-158) rearranged the sixty-six dark-woman sonnets under nine heads:

Approach: 135, 136, 131, 132, 127, 153, 154
 Love: 24, 46, 47, 23, 128, *P. P.* VIII, 145
 Slight Shadows: 94, 69, 70, 95, 96, 36, 121, 52, 75
 Separation: 50, 51, 113, 114, 27, 28, 43, 61, 48, 44, 45
 Second Meeting: Renewed Love: 97-99, 21, 130, 56, 115
 Disturbances, Resignation: 107, 108, 149, 91-93, 49
 Jealousy: 150, 141, 148, 138
 Estrangement: 88-90, 147, 139, 140
 Backward Glances: 142, 152, 143, 144, 133, 134, 137, 129

In this order, Conrad remarks, the love sonnets "present an entirely different and more favorable picture" than in the confusion of Q.

DE MARCHI (*Sh.'s Sonetti*, 1891, pp. 20-25) is unable to persuade himself that the sonnets after 17 "are directed to a powerful friend and not to an idolized woman." BUTLER (ed. 1899, pp. 17 f.) says that only nine sonnets in 127-154 (127, 128, 132-134, 139, 140, 142, 143) are addressed to the dark woman. WOLFF (*William Sh.*, 1903, p. 44), judging solely from his own "ability to feel with the poet," enumerates twenty-nine sonnets before 126 that deal with our heroine: 21, 27-29, 36, 40, 43, 48, 50-52, 56-58, 61, 75, 87-90, 92, 93, 96-98, 109, 110, 119, 120. The story (p. 53) runs this feverish course: the love begins (128, 145); the arrogant satisfaction of the first conquest still vibrates (52, 151); the passionate greetings from his journey are not evidence of a happy love (27, 28, 43, 61); doubt of her fidelity tortures him (48, 92, 93); stronger and more fatal grows her power (57, 58); he utters desperate cries of woe (75, 129); he recalls that he, too, has broken faith (142, 152); he showers her with insults (137); he breaks the spell of her beauty (150), but cannot give her up. Like an incurable disease, love gnaws at his heart (147) until he finds her in another's arms and tears himself away. Perhaps one may be pardoned for saying, as Wolff himself later would have said, "If so, the less Sh. he."

The conflict of opinion continues. Thus ROLFE (*Life*, 1904, p. 342) thinks that 129 and 146 belong to another subject than the mistress and that in 1-126 "some" (as "97, 98, 99, etc.") are written to her; while BORGHESI (*Petrarch and His Influence*, 1906, pp. 111 f.) says that the sonnets were perhaps "inspired by several persons, both male and female, although they were dedicated only to one" woman. KELLER (*Sh.'s Werke*, 1916, XV, 116) reverses the medal, denying that 129, 145, 146, 151, 153, 154 have anything to do with the black heroine. ALDEN (*Shakespeare*, 1922, p. 124) sees in 1-126 many poems without indication of sex, which "would doubtless be thought to be addressed to ladies if found elsewhere." SNIDER (*Biography*, 1922, pp. 291, 438, 498 f.,

whom some of his most exquisite portraits of womanhood were drawn." "He further believed, whatever English or German critics might say to the contrary, that some of the love-letters in sonnet form were addressed to the poet's true love Rose, and not to a male friend or to an unfaithful mistress."

503, 505 f., 511-514) lists, among others, 23, 34-36, 38, 39, 53, 81, 87, 95, 103, 107, 116, 119 as concerning her, not the friend. TUCKER (ed. 1924, pp. 1 f.) summarizes the results of his study of 1-126: thirty-nine are explicitly, eighteen¹ presumably, directed to a man, sixty-nine are doubtful as to sex, but not one of them unmistakably has a woman for its subject. Of 127-154 only five "are explicitly concerned with" the dark woman—127, 130, 132, 144, 147. Four others "are most naturally, though not indisputably," supposed to deal with her—137, 141, 148, 150. Others may refer to her, but not 128, 129, 145, 146, 151, 153, 154.

In this last year FORT (*Two Dated Sonnets*, 1924, pp. 46 f.) expressed a belief that Sh. wrote 127-152 not to his own mistress but twenty for and the other six to "someone else who was pursuing the dark siren," in all probability the Earl of Pembroke. By 1927, however (*R. E. S.*, III, 406-414), he had become convinced that 127-152 as well as 33-42 concern Sh.'s own affair with the dark woman; that (p. 407) "some of these poems [129, 138, 144, 146] cannot ever have been sent" to her, though Thorpe kept 127-152 together as a collection of lyrics on one theme; and that (p. 409) "socially she was in much the same position as Mistress Ford, or Mistress Page of *The Merry Wives*." E. G. CRAIG (*Books*, 1925, p. 154) enforced the idea that Sh. wrote the sonnets to order, and that they were "sent by a dozen men or so to as many women . . . and from five or six women to no fewer men." Of 1-126, ROBERTSON (*Problems*, 1926, pp. 262-268) declares, about thirty-two (among them 25, 27-30, 49, 52, 56-58, 66, 88-90, 92, 93, 97, 98, 109-115, 117, 118) probably have a woman as subject. Still others are dramatic, like 21, supposedly written by the friend's mother, or 39 and 48, designed for a woman to send to her lover. FLATTER (*Sh.'s Sonette*, 1934, pp. 10-13; see p. 248, below) assures us that many of 1-126 are directed at a woman, not a man. Indeed, "all the sonnets which in content and grammar do not expressly have a woman as their subject are addressed to female beings." BROOKE (ed. 1936, p. 18) remarks, "Half of this group [1-126] . . . in praise of physical beauty and in testimony of affection *could*, if read separately, be assumed to be addressed to a young woman." As examples of sonnets bearing no indication of sex, age, or appearance he cites 25, 64, 66, 71, 73, 77, 94, 116, 121, 122.

And what can one say of ALFREDO MICHELAGNOLI's summary of the plot (*Sonetto nella letteratura inglese*, 1938, pp. 8 f.)? "The sonnets are addressed to a lady whom the poet loved tenderly, but who, at first, did not return his love. With the passage of time she finally yielded. Then, like all woman of yesterday and today, she tired of the poet and looked for other distractions. In the final sonnets . . . Shakespeare laments this excessive fickleness of heart, but does not reproach her, for—he says—if she has betrayed him twice, he has betrayed her twenty times. Wonderful candor! No one knows who this lady was. He calls her from time to time 'the tenth muse,' 'the inspirer of his poetic vein,' 'the better part of himself,' and the way to follow. The first sonnets contain as a *leitmotiv* the exhortation not to die a virgin, not to die without sons in whom one may see one's own image repeated and through

¹ Actually he says nineteen, but he includes 77 in both his second and third groups.

whom one may pass on one's own existence to posterity. To die single is, according to Shakespeare, suicide, the only true suicide, because one is born again only in one's sons and returns to live once more in their beauty." Here devouring Time seems to have clawed his way backward to 1640.

The foregoing citations may be taken as specimens of how one difficulty connected with the mistress is faced or evaded. Every sonnet in the sequence has by various persons been applied to the dark woman, and her connection with every one has been denied. ALGER (*Christian Examiner*, 1862, LXXIII, 406) declared that "nine tenths of these Sonnets were written to a man," thus disposing of at least one hundred thirty-eight. His fellow American BUDD (*Sh.'s Sonnets*, 1868, p. 5) cast out the remainder: "That they are all addressed to one person, is self-evident; for, though the language is occasionally directed to other persons, the presence of this [male] person, whom he [Sh.] styles his 'Rose,' is presumed."

Nor is there any agreement that only one woman, real or fictitious, appears in Sh.'s verses. In 1836 CHATEAUBRIAND (*Œuvres complètes*, 1867, VI, 135 f.) whimsically commented: "Shakespeare must have had many loves, if one counts a love for each sonnet: total, one hundred fifty-four. . . . The poet treats himself badly enough in his little odes, and tells disagreeable truths to the objects of his devotion. . . . Commentators have conjectured that Shakespeare was rendering homage to Queen Elizabeth or to Lord Southampton, symbolically transformed into a mistress. . . . Whatever the case, many sonnets are obviously addressed to women. . . . Since Catullus it has been a question among the nurslings of the muses, whether a rose should be plucked from the stalk before it has shed its petals. Shakespeare speaks more clearly: he requests his friend [*ami*] to be reborn as a pretty little girl, who, in her turn, will be reborn as another pretty little girl, and so on: a certain means of insuring that the rose, always plucked, will never fade. . . . The creator of Desdemona and Juliet grew old without ceasing to be amorous. The unknown woman whom he addressed in charming verses—was she proud and happy to be the object of Shakespeare's sonnets? One may doubt it. Glory is for an old man what diamonds are for an old woman. They adorn her but cannot make her beautiful."

Other early writers like KNIGHT (ed. 1841), J. S. HART (1849), NEIL (1861), FULLOM (1862), MASSEY (ed. 1866), and GOEDEKE (1877), as will presently be seen, descried the presence of at least two women. Knight was no doubt behind the statement of HUDSON (*Lectures on Sh.*, 1848, I, 30) that the sonnets featuring a woman "were probably inspired by different persons" and of DELÉCLUZE (*Dante Alighieri*, 1848, p. 517) that "the last twenty-six [are addressed] to women who are not named." Once started, this notion has flourished. It was adopted by GODWIN (ed. 1900) and by BORGHESI (see p. 245, above). SAINTSBURY (*C. H. E. L.*, 1910, V, 257) comments on the possibility that the identity of the mistress in the two series "is not proved to demonstration." Similarly LUCE (*Sh. the Man*, 1913, p. 40) announces "that more than one, perhaps more than two women are rendered obscurely immortal in these sonnets." One (p. 22) "is already elderly and ugly; not merely dark, or an attractive brunette, but an 'Ethiope,' 'colour'd ill.'" The other is sketched as vaguely by Luce as (allegedly) by Sh. At any rate (p. 39), the

sonnets dealing with the two women are "utterly untrustworthy as material for biography; nothing, surely, could make either affair more unintelligible or more unreal." H. D. GRAY (*M. L. N.*, 1917, XXXII, 19) directs attention to the difference of tone in 42 and 147. "Until we reach Sonnet 142 [he writes] we have no indication that the lady is married, and indeed the opposite is implied not only in the tone but in the subject matter. . . . Moreover, in this last sequence the friend has entirely disappeared. We have only the distressing implications that the lady is now married and that Shakespeare has returned to her." But though he is unwilling to give Sh. two mistresses, he quotes his friend ALDEN as suggesting that, beginning with 142, the poet is writing of a second dark woman who is married. "There is nothing to prove that the woman of sonnets 40-42," declares REED (ed. 1923, p. 82), "is the 'dark' woman of sonnets 127 ff.," and with him DANNENBERG (*Jahrbuch*, 1934, LXX, 54) concurs. According to ROBERTSON, 1926 (see p. 246, above), some thirty-two of 1-126 concern "a woman, or women." FLATTER's view (*Sh.'s Sonette*, 1934, pp. 10-13; see p. 246, above) is that of the numerous "'female' sonnets" in 1-126 "only a small part have to do with the 'dark lady,' the greater part with a beautiful woman who was really a lady." The former, who was ugly, is featured in 40, 42, 48, and 127-152; the latter, in 21, 24, 27-31, 33-36, 66, 71, 72, 75, 87-99, 106, "and others." FRIPP (*Shakespeare*, 1938, I, 262)¹ detects "half a dozen 'ladies'—of the tavern, and the kitchen, and of the drawing-room." The picture in the sonnets is drawn from "the loose-mannered and loose-tongued women" with whom Sh. associated "in his Shoreditch days." More recently still, FRAYNE WILLIAMS (*Mr. Sh.*, 1941, p. 223) has turned up two dark women, "one of whom is crossed in the affairs of Shakespeare and one of his [two] patrons, and the other, a lady of Shakespeare's own complete friendship."

If there are two, three, six, or more women in the sonnets, the chances of ever identifying them are practically non-existent. But most writers pin their faith on one woman. Ben Jonson's comment, so E. A. ROBINSON (*Collected Poems*, 1929, p. 25) imagines, was that Sh. introduced the dark woman in his sequence "with all her poison on, To make a singing fiction of a shadow That's in his life a fact, and always will be," and that future times "Will have a more reverberant ado About her" than about Anne Hathaway. Yet her identity seems to have aroused no curiosity in MALONE, STEEVENS, BOSWELL, DYCE, COLLIER, and WHITE, among early editors.

The fun, nevertheless, began before the end of the eighteenth century. GEORGE CHALMERS started it in 1797 by arguing (*Apology*, pp. 42-66) with a perfectly straight face that 1-154 were written to QUEEN ELIZABETH. As they were composed in 1596 or 1597, Sh. was put in the somewhat embarrassing and unbiological position of exhorting in 1-17 a sixty-three-year-old queen to marry and produce an heir to perpetuate her beauty. Chalmers sought to prove his memorable thesis by showing (pp. 51 f.) that the queen "was often considered

¹ Compare his *Master Richard Quyny*, 1924, pp. 66 f.: "The poet's 'mistress' . . . [is] an impossible amalgam of qualities. . . . We detect, indeed, half a dozen 'ladies'—of the Court and of the tavern (possibly of the kitchen)." Perhaps he got this idea from *Romeo and Juliet*, II.iv.40-46.

as a man," and was called by Drant, Ascham, Spenser, and Bacon "prince," not "princess."¹ In his *Supplemental Apology*, 1799, he gave further details to demonstrate (p. 21) "1st, that Spenser addressed his *Amoretti* to Elizabeth; 2dly, that Shakspeare was ambitious of emulating Spenser; and 3dly, that Shakspeare was thus induced to address *his Sonnets* to the same Queen." He thought it incredible (p. 55) that Sh., "a husband, a father, a moral man, addressed . . . a hundred and twenty-six *Amourous Sonnets* to a *male* object," and he even quoted (pp. 58 f.) the bawdy 20 to underprop his novel contention. Perverse ingenuity could scarcely go further. But, as the *Monthly Review*, 1800 (XXXI, 189), said, "When a writer has once determined that all Shakspeare's Sonnets must relate to the same subject, and must be addressed to the same person, he will violate every rule of language in order to maintain his position." Chalmers, who for a time was a lawyer in Baltimore, was driven to this impossible theory, probably against his better judgment, because of his enmity towards Malone, the assailant of the Ireland forgeries by which he himself had been hoodwinked. Though greatly ridiculed then and now, it was taken over in part by many later writers,² and it certainly does not represent the nadir of absurdity in Shakespearean biographical interpretation.

Many writers have expressed their firm beliefs that the dark mistress was a real person without attempting to name her. In 1826 TIECK (*Penelope Taschenbuch*, pp. 321, 324) declared that she certainly existed, and that she is reflected in Rosalind, Rosaline, Beatrice, Juliet, and probably Venus.³ One compatriot of his, REGIS (*Sh.-Almanach*, 1836, p. 246), admitted, "All information is lacking about the identity of the mistress, and not even conjectures exist." Another, KÜHNE (*Weibliche und männliche Charaktere*, 1838, II, 74-

¹ A reviewer in 1797 (*British Critic*, IX, 515) described Chalmers's as "one of the wildest conceits that ever arose in any mind; and one which is refuted, even by some of the authorities which are brought by him for proof." "MARCUS" (*Monthly Mirror*, 1799, VIII, 361 f.) was also unfavorably impressed. In 1818 "PROH PUDOR" (*Blackwood's*, III, 586) knew of nobody who ever accepted Chalmers's theory. Indeed before the latter himself could have believed it, he must have regarded Sh. as "guilty of every imaginable kind of folly, stupidity, nonsense, and downright raving. . . . We would rather think George Chalmers guilty of all this, than a writer" like Sh.

² FULLOM (*History of William Sh.*, 1862, pp. 279 f.), for example, says that the queen is the subject of 78-86 (see p. 257, below). "True, one of these sonnets [79] salutes its object as 'sweet love,' which creates a difficulty . . . but the Queen allowed great latitude on this point, and in the next stanza [80] Shakespeare acknowledges that his Muse is a 'saucy bark.'" No comment seems needed. See also p. 278, below.

³ In *Dichterleben*, part II, TIECK calls her Rosaline, a dark-haired English-woman whose disgruntled husband is traveling on the Continent, and who is introduced to Southampton by the poet himself. Though the earl wins her favors, he is eventually reconciled with Sh. Poor Rosaline, however, dies in Paris from exhaustion caused by immoderate dancing. See HENRY LÜDEKE, *Ludwig Tieck*, 1922, pp. 349-355, for a discussion of the novelist's use of the sonnets.

78), thought it possible that some of the sonnets, like 130, were written by Sh. in the name of someone else; but, he goes on, through the majority there runs so strong a current of personal emotion that the poet must have written them in his own character. Who the mistress was is not of primary interest, since the poet's love was not spiritual. "The sonnets talk solely of physical pleasure and displeasure, of the torture of desire and its satiation, of the unhappiness of an urgent lust, and of the treachery and complete worthlessness of the woman who inspired it." Prudery may deplore such an affection and its expression as unworthy of a great poet; yet, everything considered, it may well reveal his sensual aberrations. "That Shakspeare came to know the dangers of hypocritical allurements should not be hard to demonstrate in many of his piqued humorists, who, satiated by ordinary femininity, wittily sneer at the demands of nature. . . . Thus many of these sonnets may be regarded as subjective preludes to the moods which Shakspeare later transformed into dramatic characters, thus ridding himself of what in itself was uncomfortable." A fourth German, ORTLEPP (*Nachträge*, 1840, III, 383), in the vein of 20 and 151, coarsely remarked: "From Shakspeare's sonnets one learns that it was the author's misfortune to languish in vain for a lovely woman. Usually when that happens to a poet some very strong prosaic fellow snaps up the damsel under his nose. For women want no poetry from men, but something altogether different. In short, as has been written, they are 'all to be cured from one point.'" With more suavity MÉZIÈRES (*Sh. ses œuvres*, 1860, p. 53) inquired, "Whom did he love?" and answered, "Nobody knows. The first law the Italian poets and their imitators imposed upon themselves was never to name the woman they were praising. At any rate, love did not make him happy." According to GRILLPARZER, 1861 (*Tagebücher*, 1930, VI, 53), "The last of these sonnets (as well as six or eight of the first) are again addressed to a woman. But they are also the worst, sharp and cold. One deduces from them that the woman was good for nothing and that Shakspeare was old—once again a disgusting emotion." No effort at identifying the dark woman was made by such believers in her reality as KREYSSIG (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, 1864, XIV, 98 f.), SIMROCK (*Sh.s Gedichte*, 1867, p. vi), or MORIZ CARRIERE (*Kunst*, 1871, IV, 479). Perhaps they thought with DOWDEN (ed. 1881, p. 17), "We shall never discover the name of that woman who for a season could sound, as no one else, the instrument in Shakspeare's heart from the lowest note to the top of the compass. . . . [Even in 1609] she perhaps was lost in the quick-moving life of London." JULIUS SCHILLER (*Sh. als Mensch*, 1897, pp. 20-22), in a rather contradictory discussion, maintained that "most of these dramatic poems are probably drawn by the poet from the souls of other people. . . . The fewest number of lyrics express the outpourings of the poet's heart." Yet the dark woman, that "interesting creature . . . who crossed the poet's path in London," must have had "a rare attractiveness," since, "despite her faults of character, she was able to bind Shakspeare with the chains of her enchantment. . . . Artistic, witty, original, . . . alluring rather than beautiful, . . . she had cast her net successfully. William loved her with all the fervor of his soul."

CONRAD (*Archiv*, 1878, LX, 39) had no doubt of the dark woman's reality. In 152, for instance, how could Sh. possibly have used so ugly a poetic fiction

except for "the lightening of his own indignant heart"? The love sonnets (the same, 1878, LIX, 257-260) do little harm to his reputation. Sh. did not "think of others who would perhaps read these effusions later and accuse him of weakness. . . . The only plain reality we can find in them is the mood of the poet." One must remember that a poet makes poetic additions to experience. At any rate, in the sonnets, as elsewhere, Sh. (the same, 1879, LXII, 171) "appears morally elevated above his age. . . . In the profound moral excitement, in the consciousness of the criminality of the affair, in the continuous, painful struggle against the evil demon of passion, he stands alone among his contemporaries." Some years later CONRAD (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, 1895, LXXIX, 184 f.) hazarded the suggestion that the woman in question "may have been the wife of a court official not too low in rank," but admitted that only the discovery of documents written in Sh.'s day can fix her name.

The dark woman probably existed, WOLFF wrote in 1903 (*Sh.'s Sonette*, pp. xiii f.), but Sh.'s account of her affair with the friend "is an unfortunate intrusion of dramatic elements into a lyrical poem." "Poor dark lady!" he sighed (*William Sh.*, 1903, pp. 88 f.). "It is right that thou shouldst remain obscure, that thou shouldst shun such treatment [as attempts at identification]. Of thee, thou lonesome hedge-rose blooming far from the road, history has kept no record. The pleasure of the hour didst thou serve, and with the hour didst thou vanish. Thy name has been forgotten; long since thy bones have moldered in unhallowed ground. Yet art thou immortal, beautiful black-eyed sinner! In human form the all-embracing spirit of the universe has reposed on thy bosom; and he who with fiery arms raises lost children to heaven spreads over thee his atoning hand and gives thee an eternal life in song." In his *Shakespeare*, 1907 (I, 290-293), WOLFF declared that Sh. was busied with the dark woman's picture throughout his creative life, and that she is the model of Rosaline, Kate, Beatrice, and Cleopatra. "The demoniacal power" of this seductive woman exerted greater and greater influence upon the poet, but no reliable news of who she was has reached us.

BERNARD SHAW (London *Nation*, 1910, VIII, 543) conceives of the nameless figure as real: "Shakespeare treated the dark lady as Hamlet treated Ophelia, only worse. He could not forgive himself for being in love with her; and he took the greatest care to make it clear that he was not duped—that there was not a bad point in her personal appearance that was lost on him even in his most amorous moments." FIGGIS (*Shakespeare*, 1911, pp. 324-326) writes that Sh.'s friend and his "dark, hot mistress" played him false, a duplicity which "revolts his whole being." Indeed, the hot woman's lustfulness "created a sexual abhorrence in his emotion" and "changed the earth for him." "Moreover, there appears a brooding power of thought and emotion rising in the plays." But this storm "was too terrible to continue long. It wore itself to an end," and the characterization of the heroines of *Cymbeline*, *The Tempest*, and *The Winter's Tale* show Sh.'s "recovery of his soul." No identification of the woman is possible, says MACKAIL (*Lectures*, 1911, p. 188), and "all the labour that has been spent upon it is pure waste." To NEILSON and THORNDIKE (*Facts*, 1913, p. 48) she is "some unknown woman," and "much research and conjecture have entirely failed to make clear the relations between the poet,

the rival poet, the lady, and the friend." Sh. actually was consumed with a passion for a married woman, ROEDDER (*Sh.s Sonette*, 1913, p. 5) insists; but who she was will never be determined unless documents contemporary with her come to light. KELLER (*Sh.s Werke*, 1916, XV, 119) warns us "not to go too far and, in seeking to preserve Shakespeare's bourgeois morality, to represent the whole affair of the dark woman as pure Platonic extravagance." Sh.'s words are too convincing. The woman had a strong hold on him.¹ In 1923 L'HOMMEDÉ (*Revue de Paris*, II, 185; see also *Secret de Sh.*, 1932, pp. 40 f.) uttered the conservative judgment that the dark woman "is only an anonymous woman, a tool of circumstance, who, like a number of her sisters, plays her part in history, solely because chance made her cross the path of a great man instead of an obscure citizen." He believed, however (see p. 261, below), that a number of sonnets refer to LADY RICH. According to ADAMS (*Life*, 1923, p. 174), "Much is fiction for the sake of artistic effect; the whole figure of the Dark Lady . . . seems to me to be an admirable stroke on the part of the dramatist, serving, as has been said, not only as a satire on the beauty and chastity of the conventional sonnet mistress, but also as a splendid foil to the superiority of friendship over love. By creating, too, an effective triangular situation, the poet was able to heighten the interest in the story-element. . . . Thus the Dark Lady can be fully justified on literary grounds. But we must not exclude the possibility that she may have had a real existence in some form."

To HELENE RICHTER (*Sh. der Mensch*, 1923, pp. 66 f.) the second series of sonnets (127-152) is marked "even more than the first as emanating from an actual experience." In it, Sh. goes far beyond conventional anti-Petrarchanism, for, "cold-blooded to the point of cruelty," he strips his mistress in all her ugliness. TUCKER (ed. 1924, p. lii n.) characterizes her as "a rather coarsely promiscuous person, almost certainly married, and apparently of no great social standing." GILLET (*Shakespeare*, 1931, pp. 132 f.) perceives in the "horrible sonnets to the dark lady" "one of those loves without tenderness, one of those tortures founded on an exclusive need . . . , one of those passions which are a reciprocal anguish," but accepts none of the identifications made up to that time. FLATTER (*Karl Kraus als Nachdichter Sh.s*, 1933, p. 34) refers to the dark woman as one whom nowadays we would call a "vamp." Sexually enslaved to her, Sh. suffered terribly, expressing his torments with a revealing distinctness that "often terrifies us." RIDLEY's opinion (ed. 1934, p. x) is, "That, whatever her name was, she existed, and that Shakespeare loved her, can hardly be doubted by anyone who reads the 'dark lady' sonnets and reads also some of the speeches of Berowne in *Love's Labour's Lost*." PARROTT (*William Sh.*, 1934, p. 193) also accepts "the lady" as a real person, but "the less said of her, perhaps, the better." "The Dark Lady . . . may be a real person who played a sinister rôle in Shakespeare's life," says KITTREDGE (ed. 1936, p. 1492), "but she is somehow connected with the dark Rosaline of *Love's Labour's Lost*. Some of the sonnets that concern her are not more serious in autobiographical significance than Berowne's paradox

¹ Keller is also emphatic about her reality in *Die englische Literatur* (with B. Fehr), 1928, pp. 70 f.

(iv, 3, 248-265; cf. v, 2, 32 ff.). . . . She must remain a mystery." "She seems," writes MURRY (*Shakespeare*, 1936, p. 113), "to have been a woman of the courtesan type, whose attraction for Shakespeare and whose hold on him was purely sensual." And "if such a woman cannot yet be found with any certainty in Shakespeare's circle," none the less, BRANDL (*Shakespeare*, 1922, 1937, p. 147) reminds us, "lack of evidence is not in private affairs a proof of unreality."

Many authorities, however, have vehemently refused to admit the dark woman's reality. As long ago as 1817 DRAKE (*Sh. and His Times*, II, 72 f.) flatly declared that her identity is "not worth the enquiry." Probably, since Sh. was a husband and father, the mistress sonnets had no "real object." DEVRIENT (*Zwei Sh.-Vorträge*, 1869, p. 30) indignantly attacked the sins of Sh.'s biographers: "None is so great perhaps and so unique in the history of literature as this, that without evidence of any sort they abstracted factual matter from the wild children of a poet's capricious imagination, and, in the absence of other data, glued together from such gratuitous scraps the most scandalous reports on his life." Shortly afterward, MINTO (*Characteristics*, 1874, pp. 276, 278) insisted: "One must not treat published sonnets addressed to a courtesan as earnest private correspondence. . . . I believe that the proper view is to regard them as exercises of skill, undertaken in a spirit of wanton defiance and derision of commonplace." 127-143 have a "gay defiant tone . . . : two or three after that are uncertain and equivocal, and the 146th seems unmistakably serious Shakespeare, having taken up the relation between a lover and a courtesan originally in wanton humorous defiance of somewhat lackadaisical effusions, his dramatic instinct could not be restrained from pursuing the relationship farther into more serious aspects." ROBERT GRANT (*Sh.'s Sonnets*, 1876, p. 40), in the first Harvard Ph.D. thesis offered in English philology, after reviewing the conflicting theories, decided: "In case any of them were addressed to his mistress . . . he did not care for her any more than Petrarch did for Laura and . . . if he had really felt the emotions portrayed in the Sonnets he never could have written them."

GRIFFIN (*English Writers*, 1895, XI, 327) regarded 127-152 as "works of pure imagination." YEATMAN (*Gentle Sh.*, 1896, pp. 296-298), however, denied that Sh. wrote them. "Perhaps there was a malicious design, in order to create a sensation to cause it to be believed that the purest writer of the age could, if he chose, be the most sensual. . . . They are not Shaksperes [*sic*]; what matters it then who wrote them?" Griffin's idea was developed with great learning by LEE (*Life*, 1898, pp. 116-124), who dismissed the dark woman as a conventional figure to be found in *Love's Labor's Lost*, in Barnabe Barnes, in Sidney, and in Etienne Jodelle. She may "be relegated to the ranks of the creatures of his [Sh.'s] fancy. It is quite possible that he may have met in real life a dark-complexioned siren, and it is possible that he may have fared ill at her disdainful hands. But no such incident is needed to account for" her presence; there is no more use in seeking for her original than for the original of Cleopatra. In 1910 LEE (*French Renaissance*, pp. 268, 274) renewed his disproof of the dark woman's existence. Sh.'s "denunciations of a false mistress of black complexion were . . . already very familiar to French sonneteers." (He cites only one sonnet by Amadis Jamyn.) In denouncing

the black woman's disloyalty, Sh. "plainly re-echoes the voice" of Jodelle's sonnet "Combien de fois mes vers ont-ils doré / Ces cheveux noirs dignes d'une Meduse?" (see the notes to 127). "The self-reproach, which Shakespeare feels or affects, for having borne false witness to the beauties and virtues of his mistress, is a constant burden of the [French] sonnet," especially of the popular Desportes.

WOLFF (*E. S.*, 1916, XLIX, 181-186), recanting an earlier faith, was even more emphatic than Lee in calling the dark woman a conventional literary figure. 127-152, he says, are anti-Petrarchan. The Italian sonneteers began early to mock the traditional attributes of female beauty, as Sh. does in 130. Woman, who embodies *amor sensuale*, was made inferior to man. All Sh.'s reproaches and curses, all his attempts to justify his lady's misdeeds by admitting himself to be at fault, are commonplaces among the Petrarchans like Bembo, Bernardo Tasso, and Torquato Tasso. The dark woman is an ingeniously constructed counterpoise to the Petrarchan ideal. Wolff's important essay, which converted many people, is approvingly summarized in PEARSON's *Elizabethan Love Conventions*, 1933 (pp. 273-282). Meantime WENDELL (*Traditions*, 1920, p. 260) had referred to the black woman as "very likely make-believe," though seemingly "genuine," and CONWAY (*Supernatural in Sh.*, 1932) had denied (p. 28) the presence of any autobiography in 40-43, 127-151, which are "quite in the conventional form," and which (p. 34) do not "refer to Shakespeare himself in any shape," even though (p. 30) "153 and one or two others . . . sound as if they were sent to some sweetheart" in London. About this time KATHARINE M. WILSON (*Calcutta Review*, 1931, 3d series, XXXVIII, 67) for purely subjective reasons found it "almost unbelievable how anyone should imagine Shakespeare wrote these sonnets to a real woman." While agreeing with Sisson (*British Academy Proceedings*, 1934, XX, 69) that by no "mythical sorrows"—and by no dark woman—was Sh. "stung into tragedy," one might reply that a notion believed in by many eminent men and women is hardly unbelievable.

Though DAVID KLEIN in 1905 (*Sewanee Review*, XIII, 472) could find "only two instances outside of Shakespeare where the epithet 'dark' is applied [to] the beloved, and one of them is doubtful," later investigators have been more fortunate. A. T. BÖDTKER (*Festschrift til Hjalmar Falk*, 1927, p. 364), for example, denies that Sh. followed Sidney "when he extolled the beauty of 'blackness' " in *Love's Labor's Lost* and in 127 and 132. Rosaline and the dark woman "belonged to the French school, and they were, like their French sisters, alternately praised and vilified. They have nothing in common with the nut-brown maids or modest dark beauties that had been condescendingly admitted into English literature before Shakespeare wrote his play, and the inference is, therefore, that Shakespeare must be credited with some first-hand knowledge of French sonnets, and that he imitated them on his own account. There is no reason to believe that Shakespeare referred to any particular woman who had crossed his path in real life, and who alternately became the object of his praise and vituperation. 'Blackness' was to him a theme taken up in accordance with the literary tendencies of his time. . . . But it was no more than a theme, and it was soon exhausted." PAUL MEISSNER (*Jahrbuch*, 1937, LXXIII, 15), on the contrary, describes the dark woman as "nothing but an

emphatic abandoning of the Italian," or Petrarchan, model—a woman who merits the distinction, says LISLE C. JOHN (*Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences*, 1938, p. 143), "of freeing at least one cycle from the meaningless phraseology employed by most of the poets of the day." But M. FRANÇON (*Notes sur l'esthétique*, 1939) reaches much the same conclusions as Bödtker. Courtly poetry of the Middle Ages, he asserts (p. 66), nearly always chose blondes for the leading role; popular poetry, on the contrary, gives first place to brunettes. Marot (p. 78), though following the courtly tradition, somewhat timidly praised brunettes; from 1545 to 1578 Ronsard (p. 92) seemed to be wrestling with the problem, but in the 1578 edition he decided definitely for brunettes. Quickly (p. 102) among the French court poets of the Renaissance the brunette succeeded the blonde. But we must not here speak of realism or sincerity. It was a literary cliché, a traditional concept, adopted suddenly, though not by all poets. The same change may be observed in Elizabethan poetry (pp. 102-108). Song 7, book II, of Nicholas Yonge's *Musica Transalpina*, 1597, speaks reservedly, "Browne is my Loue but gracefull." Sidney praises Stella's black eyes, while admitting that contemporary taste does not consider black beautiful. Raleigh, Greene, Donne appear indifferent to fair or brown, but Daniel's Delia (1930 ed., pp. xvi, 185) had hair that was golden in 1592 and sable in 1601. What Françon gathers (pp. 110 f.) from his "studies about Shakespeare's 'Dark Lady' is that the poet testifies that the blond type had been the literary and courtly ideal up to his time, and that the brunette type, during the sixteenth century, had begun to rival the blond. This latter type, in Shakespeare's very epoch, had become predominant, so that the other esthetic type was being considered a rarity or a piquant singularity." Françon (pp. 159-161) believes that the sixteenth century was a period of an emergent middle class in England, a class bringing its own popular tradition and popular song. In both the brunette was the heroine. And, of course, Italian and French influence, especially that of Ronsard, affected the English in general and then ultimately Shakespeare. "If we accept this thesis, if we see in Marot, in Wyatt, in Ronsard, in the Elizabethan sonneteers, and in Shakespeare the sign of a popular character, the presence of a theme from the popular repertory, how dangerous will it be to seek, in the works of these poets, details which could tell us anything about the identity or characteristics of the women whom these poets have praised!"

Such conclusions are too tame for many people, and the total lack of evidence to support an identification of the woman, or women, of the sonnets has been only a slight deterrent. She is (or they are) with confidence given a local habitation and a name, irrespective of whether she be a negro prostitute, a Stratford girl or matron, an unchaste maid of honor, an innkeeper's wife of loose morals, a countess, or a queen. The glib fashion in which the reputation of the Virgin Queen and other estimable ladies is besmirched should give one pause for meditation.

The sonnet story, if accepted as literally true, inevitably presents Sh. as a man whose morals were, to phrase it charitably, elastic. His confessions are explicit. He speaks of "my staine" (109.8), "my strong infection" (111.10), of a scar which "vulgar scandall stamp't vpon my brow" (112.2), of the "wretched errors" his heart has committed (119.5), of his "sportiue blood"

and "frailties" (121.6 f.). He brags of his adultery (138, 142), confesses that he has often sealed with kisses false bonds of love (142.7), and admits that people "abhor my state" (150.12)—something not unreasonable if he wrote and circulated other filthy sonnets like 20, 144, and 151.

Whether or not BENSON thought he recognized scandalous details in the sonnets is still disputed (see pp. 24 f., above). The antiquary WILLIAM OLDYS (who died in 1761) is about the earliest writer definitely to refer to scandal. Annotating the life of Sh. in Gerard Langbaine's *Account of the English Dramatick Poets*, 1691 (British Museum), he observed that "a *Lover's Affection*" (92-95, as they appear in the 1640 edition) "seems to be written to his *beautiful* wife under some rumour of inconstancy." MALONE (see the notes to 93), unperturbed by this hint, contented himself with writing under Oldys's a note (first printed in Malone's ed. 1780, p. 653) to the effect that he knew of no reason why Mrs. Sh. should be called beautiful, though she may well have given her husband cause for jealousy. But many critics in the early nineteenth century, while accepting Shelley, Byron, and Goethe without blushing, found it intolerable to visualize the great dramatist, a paterfamilias, as sporting with Amaryllis in the shade or with the black-wire tangles of Neaera's hair. With his typically Gallic ire aroused by DRAKE's comments (*Sh. and His Times*, 1817), DE WAILLY (*Revue des deux mondes*, 1834, 3d series, IV, 694) exclaimed: "When I hear this great man complaining about the infidelities of his mistress, comparing himself to a child who weeps so that his mother will take him back into her arms, he appears to me a thousand times greater, a thousand times better, than all the male or female prudes in England." One male prude, RICHARDSON (*G. M.*, 1835, n. s., IV, 361), no doubt ignorant of this blast from France, vigorously enunciated his horror of the sonnet story: "Considering that he was a married man and a father, . . . his extravagant love for a notoriously low and licentious woman . . . certainly throws a shade upon his moral character; his thinking it necessary to publish and immortalize the matter, makes it a thousand times worse."

Then KNIGHT (ed. 1841) transmogrified the robust Elizabethan into a virtuous Victorian head of a family, explaining that his wife was the recipient of several sonnets, and that the "dark-haired lady of questionable character" (p. 107) who is the subject of many others was (pp. 113 f.) probably fictitious. Knight at least faced the situation squarely, if primly. But most of his imitators failed to realize that in dragging ANNE HATHAWAY SH. into the story they blackened her name or her poet husband's or both.

BARRETT (*American [Whig] Review*, 1847, VI, 308) for a while toyed with the notion that 109-119 were written to "poor Anne," but as he read the later sonnets carefully he felt "abundant sadness . . . that such a thing was impossible." NEIL, FULLOM, HUDSON, and others read with less attentiveness. Otherwise, how could they have failed to see that if Mrs. Sh. is present in only a part of the sequence, at least one more woman is involved; or that if she is the only woman there depicted, her husband is to be applauded for abandoning her and flying to London and to be condemned for returning to Stratford and the second-best bed? How apologists for the poet's morals can hope to make an honest woman out of the dark lady by equating her with "poor Anne" remains a mystery to an observant reader of 144, 147, and 152. J. S. HART

(*Sartain's Magazine*, 1849, V, 218-222) did get the point. He followed Knight in asserting that the woman of 127, 130-132 (plus 21, 56-58, 139, 145, "with some others in the same vein that will be found scattered through the collection") was "the Stratford beauty," Anne Hathaway; but he added that some twenty-five sonnets (33-35, 40-42, 94-96, 118-120, 129, 133, 134, 137, 138, 141, 142, 144, 147, 148, 150-152) deal with a "guilty passion . . . for an object known to be unworthy, and in open violation of conjugal vows"—"painful and humiliating to contemplate." Evidently Hart saw a third woman in the sequence, for he says that about sixty sonnets "expressive of constancy in friendship . . . seem on the whole to have been addressed to a female friend."

NEIL's decision (*Shakespeare*, 1861, p. 108) that "many . . . were addressed to Anne Hathaway, as bride and wife; several to his daughter (*e. g.*, 62); some to Queen Elizabeth (*e. g.*, 83-86, and 106)" scarcely harmonizes with the situation or flatters the morals of Mr. and Mrs. Sh. It appealed, however, to FULLOM (*History of William Sh.*, 1862, pp. 205-208), who designates Mrs. Sh. as the person addressed in 104 and 105, young Hamnet Sh. in 108. "These sonnets," Fullom writes, ". . . now remove the cloud both from his married life and his good name"; but that is a *non sequitur*, even if all the sonnets (especially 144, 147, 152) were written to Mrs. Sh., in which case may heaven have pitied her husband. Fullom adds (pp. 279 f.) that Sh. addresses the queen in 78-86. R. G. C. (*Public Opinion*, 1864, V, 153) was another to recognize the presence of "the beautiful Anne Hathaway," as well as references to the child she bore a few months after her wedding. HUDSON (ed. 1856) was uninterested in the dark woman, but in 1872 (*Sh.: His Life*, I, 24 f.) he informed readers that to Anne Hathaway "were addressed, in his early morn of love, three sonnets . . . [135, 136, 143], which are hardly good enough to have been his work at any time; certainly none too good to have been the work of his boyhood"; to her three others (he enumerates only 97 and 98) were written "much later in life," as were also "a third cluster, of nine" (he lists only 110, 111, 117).

More Victorian than the Victorians was the German ADOLF BEKK, whose amusing *William Sh.*, 1864, deserves to be better known. Sh.'s affair (pp. 26 f.) with the dark woman "was a sensual infatuation, . . . a demoniacal spell, which held him despite his better judgment—Tannhäuser in the Venusberg; but one can tell from the uneasy tone of these verses that they did not flow from the deeper regions of the heart. . . . A second, much deeper love is the subject of . . . 46, 47, 56, 57, 96-100, 113, 114, 27, 28, 43-46, 50, 51, 61." Bekk takes pleasure in surmising that these twenty (he says eighteen) delightful poems were written partly in Stratford, partly soon after his departure, and later on the occasion of his return. They were, accordingly, "addressed to his first love, to the mother of his children." Bekk gives an affecting picture (pp. 72 f.) of Sh.'s first departure from Stratford amid the lamentations, expressed or implied, of Mrs. Sh., Susanna, and the twins. The would-be poet indomitably resisting such pleas as "Willy [or Father], don't leave us," cries out, "Either I'll return to make you happy, or never again!" Literature paid, and "ten years later his family lived in the most beautiful house in Stratford, whose richest citizen he now was." Bekk should be required reading for scholars.

He had a worthy follower in DEVRIENT (*Zwei Sh.-Vorträge*, 1869, pp. 32-43), whose "Victorian" sketch also deserves pondering. "No wild, boundless in-

stinct, which combats the moral order, but a pure, sober, lawful love" speaks out of 21, 127, 130-132, 147. In Sh.'s praise we recognize a good, brown, trustworthy country girl, Anne Hathaway, the farmer's daughter. Most interpreters tell a disgusting story of Southampton, Elizabeth Vernon, and Sh., finding it in 42, 87, 133, 134, and others—which are nothing but "exercises based on the similar theme" in *The Two Gentlemen*, Act V—or of Sh. and a negress. Actually, he "sought to ease his separation from home and family by annual visits"—see 50 and 51. In 27 he describes the torments of homesickness. Often the sonnets seem to be letters and their answers, and every poet knows how to write poems in the person of another. Not only the male sex of the person addressed, but especially "the over-delicate, fearful, exaggerated, pampering love of a woman—particularly of an older woman—might induce us to place many sonnets, following Goethe's example [*Werke* (Weimar, 1888), division I, II, 10-12], under the heading: 'the loving woman writes'"—many like 22, 48, 62-64, 77, 97-99, 104, 122. Other sentimental details are given ("Without the true, dear support of his loving and beloved wife Shakespeare's sublime talent might easily have perished like that of . . . Green, Marlowe, Nash, etc." [p. 47]), and for good measure we are told (pp. 76 f.) that 57, 58, and others were probably addressed to QUEEN ELIZABETH.

MORIZ CARRIERE (*Kunst*, 1871, IV, 479 f.; see further his *Poesie*, 1884, p. 429) regretfully admits that Sh. sinned with the black enchantress—that he sinned and in 110 repented. "And why should not this sonnet, like so many others, be addressed to his wife in Stratford? Why should it not be she whose ardent sympathy heals the wounds that alien harshness dealt him, she who is his world, who lives so powerfully in his heart that everything else seems in comparison dead?" GENÉE (*Shakespeare*, 1872, pp. 40 f.) thinks that Anne appears often in the sonnets, as in 97-99, 135, 136, 143. GOEDEKE (*Deutsche Rundschau*, 1877, X, 402-409) explains that 37 and 38 are addressed to QUEEN ELIZABETH, 52 and 108 to young Hamnet Sh., and 29, 44, 45, 48, 50, 51, and others to Mrs. Sh. JAMES WALTER (*Sh.'s True Life*, 1890, pp. 180-182) declares, as if there were no possible doubt, that 109-111, 116, 117 were written for Mrs. Sh., in whom the poet found "all wisdom, goodness, beauty, and delight." "Whoever has slandered Shakespeare must have done so in ignorance of their existence." All this is unsound reasoning, for the black woman still hovers over the horizon of 127-154, a figure more ominous than ever to the reputation, morals, and health¹ of the poet who in 109-111, 116, and 117 has supposedly vowed undying affection for his wife.

¹ It was inevitable that somebody should find unmistakable intimations (and symptoms) of immorality in the sonnets. LANDAUER (*Shakespeare*, 1920, II, 368) hints at syphilis: "I perceive how the poet associates his disease, his increasing impotence, his premature old age, and the approach of death with his sensual passion and debauchery; and I perceive his despondency and his melancholy, verging on madness, as not merely a spiritual but also a fleshly result and accompanying phenomenon of the illness which corroded him. How loathsome to him is his body, as if death were already greedily devouring it." Compare also 144.14 n. Totally different news about Sh.'s sickness and death was given by A. GUTHMANN in 1925 (*Jahrbuch*, LXI, 89-93).

Anne Hathaway has had only a few other backers.¹ VON MAUNTZ (Sh.'s *Gedichte*, 1894, p. 342) guesses that Sh., forced to leave home by his father's financial reverses, wrote 27, 28, 43-45, 48, 50, 51, 61, 113, 114 to his wife or children. GODWIN (ed. 1900), who duplicates (p. 96) the sentimental details of Bekk and Devrient, rearranges the sonnets, and his fourth division (pp. 89-130, 243-261), "A Young Love-Time" (see pp. 94 f., above), is addressed to Mrs. Sh., 32 being the poet's farewell as he sets off for the first time to London. Once there he meets a dark woman (p. 131), "already married, young, and accomplished as a musician, and of . . . impressive appearance," but, though captivated by her, he continues (pp. 161 f.) to write sonnets, like 109 and 119, to his estranged wife.² EICHHOFF (*Unser Sh.*, 1903, part II) in addition to discovering that Sh. wrote only sixteen of the sonnets in Q reveals (p. 62) that fourteen of them were sent to Anne.

ANNA B. McMAHAN (*Sh.'s Love Story*, 1909), certain (p. 28) that "one and one only" fills Sh.'s "mind's eye and wins his heart's love," indignantly denies that Mrs. Sh. was unloved or was deserted by her husband. We are implored (pp. 82 f.) not to believe "that the most eloquent love poems in the English tongue were written by one man to another." Instead all, composed at irregular intervals from 1580-1582 (as 25, 99, 102, 104, 106, 115, 116) to 1609 (as 76), were sent to Anne Hathaway. Nothing is said of 1-17, which, if Anne be the recipient, were certainly written before she was married to Sh. late in November, 1582; but perhaps we are to infer that the arguments of 1-17, though ostensibly addressed to a man, helped to overcome her pre-nuptial scruples, and thus led to the birth of her daughter six months after the wedding. McMahan dodges these sonnets with their masculine nouns and pronouns, but (pp. 75 f.) she does admit that in London Sh. "meets court ladies, free . . . sometimes of morals, and surrenders to their spell more than afterwards he is able to forgive himself." But some of the curse is taken off his reprehensible conduct by "his yearly visit to the Stratford home." And so (p. 84) "whoever is wise . . . may see for himself . . . that Shakespeare, in his sonnets, was a lover speaking to his beloved" wife.³ Another of the wise,

¹ CHIARINI (*Nuova antologia*, 1890, 3d series, XXVI, 461, XXVII, 139) denies that she is anywhere addressed, on the typical Latin ground that the poet who at eighteen had married Anne for love, and who had left her when he was twenty-two, could not live in London "like a monk in a cloister."

² According to BRANDL's review (*Archiv*, 1910, CXXIV, 217) of BALTZER's *Die schönsten Sonette von W. Sh.*, 1910, that translator had similar ideas: "As sources for Shakespeare's personal life B. [*sic*] offers us 34, 69, 70, 96. Under the heading 'Do the Sonnets Refer to Shakespeare's Marriage?' he reprints 48 in English and sees in the addressee the wife of the poet. That Shakespeare's wife characterizes the poems and sonnets as *trifles* 'is very natural if one remembers the difficult circumstances of his early marriage.' He links the travel sonnets 50, 51, 97 with Shakespeare's home. In answer to the question 'Who was the dark lady?' B. conjectures that in a life as active as that led by Shakespeare disturbances of marital bliss cannot have been lacking. Everything else he interprets as jest or gossip."

³ Compare BRAINERD MCKEE (*Sh. in Limerick*, 1910, no. XXXVI):

W. T. SHORE (*Sh.'s Self*, 1920, pp. 37-42), shares these convictions: "It is not unknown for poets to love their wives and to write poems to them," like 25, 27, 28, 50, 51, 71, 91-105, 109-120, 135, 136 to his wife. "Not in one," says Shore (p. 88), conveniently ignoring such lyrics as 144, "is there foundation upon which to erect castles of conjecture inhabited by dark ladies." Finally NOYES, 1924 (*New Essays*, 1927, p. 113), observing that by some unknown person "the sonnets were collected and arbitrarily arranged to suggest a story," at which Sh. himself "may have chuckled," insists that many of them, "far more than is usually recognised, owe their connection with the 'story' to nothing more than the fact that they are love sonnets and are included in the volume, at a fairly suitable place. But there is nothing whatever to show that the hundred and nineteenth sonnet [he apparently means 99], for instance, was not addressed to Shakespeare's own wife. This explanation certainly fits it better than any other; for any other explanation would make it a piece of nauseating hypocrisy. There are other sonnets of which the same may be said."¹

Sh.'s reputation was given a different sort of whitewashing by MASSEY (ed. 1866), in a vehement exposition of the sonnets as dramatic compositions on the quadrangle plot of Southampton and ELIZABETH VERNON, Pembroke and LADY PENELOPE RICH (see pp. 88-90, above). Many, he declared, were written for Southampton to give to Vernon, others for Vernon to express her jealousy of the dark Lady Rich, whose name is punned on in 146.12. At once BELL (*Fortnightly*, 1866, V, 735), unimpressed by Massey's furbelows and flounces, dissented: there is not an iota of evidence that Sh. knew Vernon, much less that she engaged him to write sonnets for her; or that Pembroke really loved Lady Rich, who (p. 740) was seventeen years his senior and the mistress of Lord Mountjoy. The *Athenaeum*, April 28, 1866 (p. 554), likewise scoffed at Massey's interpretation, since Lady Rich "was double Pembroke's age; she had half-a-dozen children grown up. She was Montjoy's mistress-wife, and Montjoy was to Herbert a friend, almost a father." Unmoved by hostile criticism, Massey reissued his book in 1872, and in its final, enlarged edition (1888) he gave no indication that there had been or could be a single doubt of the complete establishment of his theory. He boasted (p. 11) that the Swiss translator KRAUSS (1872) had adopted it (see also Krauss's articles in *Nord und Süd*, 1879, VIII, 226-243, and *Jahrbuch*, 1881, XVI, 144-212). He might have added that GELBCKE had based his translation (1867) upon it and that HENRY BROWN (*Sonnets of Sh.*, 1870, pp. 128-163) had followed it to the extent of saying (p. 128) that 127-154 were, not directly, but "covertly

"Bill Shakespeare wrote many a sonnet:
He gave one, instead of a bonnet,
Each Easter to Anne—
He gave it—then ran—
And left her to meditate on it."

¹ For B. R. WARD's interpretation of the black woman as Mrs. Sh., see p. 161, above; for WILLIAM ROSS's (1939), p. 227, above. The latter dates the sonnets from April, 1582, to early 1584.

levelled at Lady Rich." Some of his critical hodge-podge, too, was taken over by ALBERT LINDNER (*Westermanns illustrierte deutsche Monatshefte*, 1884, LVI, 109-115), who in a popular article luridly sketched the biography of Lady Rich. She was depicted by Sh. in *Love's Labor's Lost* as Rosaline, and she was, at least partly, equivalent to the dark woman—though Lindner gallantly balked at the flat feet and wiry hair of 130. VON MAUNTZ (*Jahrbuch*, 1893, XXVIII, 321, 325 f.) hedged by saying that the sonnets are possibly dramatic and may have been written for one of Sh.'s fellow-actors who had an affair with a lady of the court, but that some are perhaps addressed to Lady Rich. Almost no one else has paid any attention to Massey's romantic views. This neglect is all the more deplorable in the light of MASSEY's modest claims (ed. 1866, p. 436) for his interpretation: "It is the only one that surmounts the obstacles, disentangles the complications, resolves the discords, and out of various voices draws the one harmony. It ignores no difficulty, violates no fact, strains no point . . . ; it gathers up every possibility, and is consistent from beginning to end."

Lady Rich, none the less, bobs up on all occasions. For example, A. HALL (*Academy*, 1897, LII, 207), on the strength of 152, equated her with the sonnet heroine: she was related to Sh. through his mother; to the friend, Southampton, through his wife. L'HOMMEDÉ (*Revue de Paris*, 1923, II, 183-185; *Secret de Sh.*, 1932, pp. 28-40), to whom the friend is Essex, also brings her in. Lady Rich asks Sh. to write sonnets for her. He responds with 153 and 154, which are favorably received (145), as are also 135, 136, 143. They become lovers (128, 151), but all too soon Penelope's eyes rove elsewhere (139), while the poet laments (140, 146). Then the malicious Greene tells Essex about Sh.'s affair with his frail sister, a fact to be remembered in reading 110, 111, 113, 121, 125, 33, 87. Later Sh. falls in love with a brown woman (see p. 252, above), who plays him false with Essex (see, among others, 94-96, 34, 40-42, 62). They "depart," leaving the poet to his own resources (see 36, 133, 134, 129, 144). One becomes dull flesh in comparison to the fiery race of this Frenchman's imagination.

Meanwhile, in 1884, MACKAY (*Nineteenth Century*, XVI, 246 f.) had expressed his firm conviction that Pembroke, not Sh., actually composed the sonnets on the black woman,¹ a person for whom his "platonic affection . . . gradually grew . . . into something warmer and more sensual." He identifies her as CHRISTIAN BRUCE, the wife of William Cavendish, second Earl of Devonshire (1590-1628); and, confusing Cavendish with Charles Blount, Earl of Devonshire (died 1606), calls her the matrimonial successor of Lady Penelope Rich (died 1607). Mackay's "gradually" can hardly be the correct word; for Christian Bruce was born on December 28, 1595, and she married Devonshire in April, 1608, "aged twelve years and three months" (*Complete Peerage*, 1916, IV, 340 f.). R. in *Shakespeariana*, 1884 (I, 295), thought it not "in the least unlikely" that Pembroke did write the sonnets to LADY DEVONSHIRE, "who was beautiful, dark-eyed, dark-haired, and accomplished." But it scarcely seems possible that what Mackay calls "the charms of . . . [her]"

¹ For the other woman of the sonnets, QUEEN ELIZABETH (plus her lover Leicester), see page 92, above.

person, the attraction of her manners" could have moved Pembroke (or Sh.) to sonneteering before *Q* was published in 1609.¹

As Mrs. Sh. and Lady Rich gradually faded out on the screen, their place was usurped by a more dangerous and longer-lived rival, Mistress MARY FITTON. That brittle girl, daughter of Sir Edward Fitton (1548?-1606) and his wife Alice Holcroft, was baptized at Gawsorth church, Cheshire, on June 24, 1578. By 1595 she was one of the queen's maids of honor, a title which she falsified by becoming the mistress of young Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, to whom she bore a son about March, 1601. The child died. Its father, refusing marriage, was sent to the Fleet prison by the furious queen; while its mother continued her irregularities, bearing two bastard daughters to Sir Richard Leveson. In 1607 Fitton married Captain William Polwhele. TYLER (ed. 1890, pp. 86-89), with 152.3 in mind, argued that before 1599 she had made "an actual marriage, or what might be considered as such," to Captain Lougher or "some other person." In his first *D. N. B.* sketch of Mary Fitton (1889) LEE acknowledged that Tyler's theory "is ingenious, but the present state of the evidence does not admit of its definite acceptance." But in his life of Pembroke, a few volumes later (1891), he granted it his full approval, remarking (with a characteristic adverb), "Shakespeare's young friend was doubtless Pembroke himself, and 'the dark lady' in all probability was Pembroke's mistress, Mary Fitton." He expressed a belief (in words reappearing in the revised *D. N. B.* of 1908) that Fitton's alleged 1599 marriage "did not take place . . . or that her first husband's name is lost, and that Lougher was a third husband." She died, according to LADY NEWDIGATE-NEWDEGATE (*Gossip from a Muniment-Room*, 1898, Appendix C) in 1647.

TYLER—called by BERNARD SHAW, in an unforgettable sketch (*Misalliance*, etc., 1914, pp. 104-107), "a gentleman of such astonishing and crushing ugliness that no one who had once seen him could ever thereafter forget him"—is the father and prop of the Fitton theory, which he outlined and defended in a series of articles² in the '80's before publishing his 1890 edition. A pamphlet of 1898, *The Herbert-Fitton Theory . . . A Reply*, was included in the "cheap issue" of that book (ed. 1899). He died early in 1902. His hypothesis was, of course, anchored on the assumption that Sh.'s friend was Pembroke. TYLER admitted (ed. 1890, p. 76) his inability to prove any personal connection between Sh. and Fitton, but he relied on the vigorous support (1884-1886) of W. A. HARRISON, who (*Academy*, 1884, XXVI, 9 f.) noted that William Kemp, the famous comedian of Sh.'s company, had dedicated his *Nine Days' Wonder*, 1600, to her, though giving her name wrongly as Anne.³ The two enthusiasts

¹ In a totally different connection STOPES (*Jahrbuch*, 1890, XXV, 194) mentions the countess as "far above the breath of any scandal," as "the Lady of Royal descent who raised the glory of the Cavendishes."

² As well as in the introduction to the PRAETORIUS facsimile of *Sh.'s Sonnets*, 1886, pp. xviii-xxiii. He first suggested it in March and April, 1884 (see his remarks in the *Academy*, 1888, XXXIV, 388 n.).

³ Hence it was to be expected that sooner or later somebody, like G. A. TAYLOR (*N. & Q.*, April 3, 1926, p. 243), would identify the dark woman with ANNE FITTON, Mary's sister, who had married Sir John Newdigate in 1587.

convinced themselves that if Kemp knew Fitton well enough to give her Christian name incorrectly, his fellow Sh. must also have been well enough acquainted with her to become her lover.

When in 1884 Tyler presented his speculations about Fitton before the New Sh. Society, according to STOPES (*Life of . . . Southampton*, 1922, p. vi) everybody who heard him admired and approved.¹ Again, at a meeting of the Society five years later, October 11, 1889 (*Academy*, 1889, XXXVI, 274 f.), Furnivall and everybody else present except Stopes unreservedly endorsed Tyler's hypothesis. Yet most of his converts quickly relapsed into militant apostasy. ROLFE (ed. 1890, pp. 186 f.) and more cautiously VERITY (ed. 1890, p. 402) did accept Tyler's theory,² but almost simultaneously STOPES (*Poet-Lore*, 1890, II, 466-469) was combating it. Her arguments were that (1) even if Fitton actually was a brunette she was not ugly (152); (2) she was not abhorred by others (150), but instead was loved by her family and the queen; (3) there is no evidence of her acquaintance with Sh.; and (4) she was not married when the dark-woman sonnets were written.

In the next year FURNIVALL visited Arbury Hall to examine "the two or three" extant portraits of Fitton (Tyler had relied solely on her effigy³ in Gaws-worth church), and he saw at once (*Academy*, 1891, XXXIX, 282 f., 325) that

Kemp calls Anne a maid of honor to the queen: she was not (see V. A. WILSON, *Queen Elizabeth's Maids of Honour*, 1922, pp. 262-264. W. C. HAZLITT [*Shakespeare*, 1902, p. 186]—perhaps following J. P. EARWAKER [*East Cheshire*, 1880, II, 566]—had described both Mary and Anne as holding such a position. TYLER [*Academy*, 1890, XXXVII, 171; see also *Athenaeum*, October 19, 1889, pp. 531 f.] says that Anne married Sir John Newdigate "at the early age of twelve; and, in consequence, she could not possibly have been maid of honour in 1600."). LEE (*D. N. B.*, 1889, 1908) denies that Kemp intended to dedicate his book to Mary, saying that the employment of Lady Newdigate's maiden name agrees with "a common contemporary practice."

¹ She gives the date 1890, but evidently she referred to the paper read on May 30, 1884, at the conclusion of which "a vote of thanks to Mr Tyler . . . [was] unanimously passed" and the chairman, FURNIVALL, "described the paper as the most important contribution that had yet been made to the difficult subject of the *Sonnets*." (See *N. Sh. S. T.*, 1880-1886, pp. 89*-96*.) After Tyler's second paper, June 13, Furnivall expressed some reservations about Fitton as the dark woman (p. 105*) because she was unmarried during her liaison with Pembroke. But W. E. A. AXON (*Western Antiquary*, 1886, VI, 115-117) was favorably inclined to Tyler's side.

² Fitton has been welcomed by the Italians, as OLIVIERI (Sh.'s *Sonetti*, 1890, p. xxxiii), CHIARINI (*Nuova antologia*, 1890, 3d series, XXVII, 130-135), and SANFELICE (Sh.'s *154 sonetti*, 1898, pp. 42 f.).

³ A. W. WARD (*History*, 1899, II, 32 n.) called the Gaws-worth effigies thoroughly unreliable, as they show Anne and Mary Fitton to be practically identical. In *Literature*, 1900, VII, 353, TYLER asserts that the effigies are totally different. The reader will find a reproduction of the tomb in J. P. EARWAKER's *East Cheshire*, 1880, volume II, facing p. 582.

they bore no resemblance to the descriptive details in the sonnets. His conclusions called forth profitless, and somewhat acrimonious replies from Tyler, but were upheld by C. G. O. BRIDGEMAN (the same, 1892, XLI, 40). Shortly thereafter an American professor, L. W. SPRING (*Education*, 1894, XIV, 602) professed belief that Sh.'s (alleged) relations with Fitton "disclose a serious lapse in morals" which cannot be defended, and which shows him to be totally lacking in "power of will"; and the well-known BRANDES (*William Sh.*, 1896, I, 327-340) enthusiastically accepted, and embroidered, Tyler's theory. Just a year later CHAMBERS (*Academy*, 1897, LII, 98) called it "incredible," because Fitton was unmarried when the sonnets were composed; and the mistress of Arbury Hall, LADY NEWDIGATE-NEWDEGATE, in *Gossip from a Muniment Room*, 1897, reproduced two portraits of Fitton, which proved her to have had (p. 25) "handsome grey eyes, fair complexion, and rather a long thin nose." Mary (p. 33) "was fair, not 'dun'-complexioned, her hair was brown, not 'black wires,' and her eyes were grey, not 'raven-black.'" TYLER (*Academy*, 1897, LII, 155) had talked to Lady Newdigate, and had expected her forthcoming book to support him. WILLIAM ARCHER (*Fortnightly*, 1897, LXVIII, 834) even pretended to think, that it had "enormously strengthened" the case for Fitton. Actually the book practically eliminated her, in spite of the outcries of TYLER (*Herbert-Fitton Theory*, 1898), who, strangely enough, was now supported by FURNIVALL (*Theatre*, 1897, XXX, 296) in challenging the authenticity of the portraits. Tyler prophesied (p. 22) "the eventual general acceptance" of his views about the dark woman. But in her second edition (1898, pp. 165-174) LADY NEWDIGATE-NEWDEGATE added further and unquestionable evidence from BRIDGEMAN that at least one, probably two, of the pictures was genuine.

Very few persons since 1898 (one is tempted to say no person who knows the facts) have followed Tyler.¹ As his erstwhile disciples dropped by the way he was especially galled by LEE, who after writing in the first issue (1891) of the *D. N. B.* that "'the dark lady' in all probability was Pembroke's mistress, Mary Fitton," went over to the Southampton camp and relegated (*Life*, 1898, pp. 122 f.) the dark woman "to the ranks of the creatures of his [Sh.'s] fancy." The changeable VON MAUNTZ (*Jahrbuch*, 1898, XXXIV, 388-390) was also persuaded by the portrait discussions that Fitton was out of the running, and that the dark woman could not be identified. But TYLER, game to the last, tied his faith (*Saturday Review*, 1899, LXXXVII, 50) to the Gawsworth monument which, he thought, supported his theory, and spurned the canvases that undermined it. Readers of the literary weeklies, to which he sent a continuous stream of letters, may have got the temporary impression that *l'affaire Fitton* was as important as Dr. Jameson's raid, the Second Jubilee, and the Boer War.

Not everybody, however, describes Fitton's features in the same way. LEE (*Fortnightly*, 1898, LXIX, 217) accepts Lady Newdigate-Newdegate's decision that the two Arbury portraits show "a lady of fair complexion with brown

¹ Among them were FILON (*Revue des deux mondes*, 1901, 5th series, II, 806-809), PEMBERTON (*New Shakespeareana*, 1908, VII, 105 f., 1909, VIII, 66 f.), and ADOLF BARTELS (*Einführung in die Weltliteratur*, 1913, I, 662).

hair and grey eyes"; SCHÜCKING (*Frankfurter Zeitung*, March 26, 1907, erstes Morgenblatt, p. 1) says that their subject "was blond and had gray eyes." ROEDDER (*Sh.'s Sonette*, 1913, pp. 5 f.) sees in them "dark blond hair and light-blue eyes," CHARLES STRACHEY (*T. L. S.*, January 5, 1922, p. 13) blue eyes, GREENWOOD (the same, January 12, p. 29) "a fair woman with grey-blue eyes," EAGLE (*Saturday Review*, 1922, CXXXIII, 633) and ALEXANDER (*Sh.'s Life*, 1939, p. 96) fair hair and blue eyes. Whatever their exact color, nobody who looks at the pictures can believe that, like the dark woman's, Fitton's eyes and hair were as dark as night and as black as hell.

In the *D. N. B.* ("Fitton"), 1908, LEE called Tyler's "a fanciful theory, which does not admit of serious consideration," while in *Sh.'s Life*, 1898 (pp. 123 n., 406 n., 415 n.), he had dealt even harder blows—he "absolutely demolishes the theory," COURTHOPE (*History*, 1903, IV, 33) rules. Another damaging attack was made by BERNARD SHAW, who, after writing *The Dark Lady of the Sonnets* about Fitton in 1910, declared in a later preface (*Misalliance*, etc., 1914, p. 103) his disbelief in her alleged connection with Sh.; for the Arbury portraits show her to have been "a fair lady. . . . That settles the question."

By 1914 the question was as nearly settled as any about the myriad-minded Sh. can be. Perhaps the advocacy of CREIGHTON (*Sh.'s Story*, 1904)¹ had contributed to this end; for, with a blithe disregard of evidence, he elaborated Tyler's theory out of all reason. He asserted (p. 6) that 100-154 are "the successive stages of a strange attempt by the poet to persuade Lord Pembroke to father an impending infant [of Fitton's] which was not his. The alleged real father . . . is darkly indicated in S. 124 as a certain courtier or statesman; and in the upshot it appears that Shakespeare himself was impeached of the paternity, falsely as he alleges, and upon suborned information."² Sh.'s "entanglement" with Fitton (pp. 354-380) is retold in *Measure for Measure*. That dishonest maid of honor is not only Mariana of the moated grange but, in part, Cressida and Ophelia.

What other stellar roles Creighton neglected to enumerate for Fitton were supplied by HARRIS (*Man Sh.*, 1909). He uncritically misdescribes (p. 201) Tyler's work on the sonnets, with its discovery of the Pembroke-Fitton-Sh. triangle, as of higher merit "than that of Coleridge on the plays." The identical plot, he says (pp. 203-211), reappears in *The Two Gentlemen*, *Much Ado*, and *Twelfth Night*. Fitton, indeed (pp. 212 f.), recurs "in play after play," for Sh. "was the most impassioned lover and love-poet in all literature." One of the characters in JOYCE's *Ulysses*, 1922 (p. 188), canonized Harris's book as "surely brilliant." ARNOLD BENNETT (*Journals*, 1932, I, 329 f.), too, called it "masterful and masterly," "glorious," and he puffed it in a review. Few other readers were impressed, unless by the author's soaring imagination and by his reconstructive powers that rivaled those of Cuvier before a solitary bone. It seems likely that, as HARRIS, retelling the fantastic story in his *Women of Sh.*,

¹ Some of his material first appeared in *Blackwood's*, 1901, CLXIX, 829-845. It may be noted here that BEGLEY (*Is It Sh.?*, 1903, p. 198) says it is very likely that Fitton was the mistress of "Sh.," or Bacon, but that (p. 214) 40-42 concern a "common drab."

² Fitton's child by Pembroke is (pp. 58 f.) the subject of 99 and others,

1911, predicted (p. 105), "the professor-pedants [will continue to] hum and ha and purse dry lips and wish there were 'some evidence of this passion.'"

Just while incredulous professors were annoying Harris,¹ SMEATON (*Shakespeare*, 1911, pp. 466, 469) indulged in some very odd fence-straddling that must have been far more annoying, identifying the friend with Southampton, the dark woman with Fitton. Here's a how-de-do. In 1915 E. A. VIZETELLY (*Loves of the Poets*, 1915, pp. 62-70) went into great detail about Fitton, whom oddly he called "the only present-day candidate" for her dark ladyship, but he rendered "the Scotch verdict, 'Not proven.'"

WILLI DÜNWALD (*März*, 1916, X, ii, 51), however, paid his devoir to her ("it is easy to imagine how the favor of [such] a court lady . . . could awaken in a country boy like Shakespeare everything that was eager to be awakened").² F. J. FARNELL (*International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 1920, I, 408-413) also swallowed Tyler's theory hook and sinker. His scientific discussion tells how Sh. falls in love with Fitton, and writes of her with "expressions of love, anguish, blind wrath and disgust." He "attempts to adjust himself . . . by producing 'All's Well'"—unsuccessfully. Fitton bears Herbert a son, and Sh. depicts her in Goneril and Lady Macbeth. In 142 he shows, in his love and hate, "the projection mechanism in the delusional systems of paranoia." "When Mary left him in death [actually she died in 1647] he fell into despair, grew very nervous and went home. He lost his wife early in his sensual career [actually she died in 1623] and now he has lost his wanton-mistress sweetheart. He turns to his mother [actually she died in 1608] and his daughter. His sublimations are now directed towards his 'dear mother' whom he has never rendered enough courtesy or done enough for as is seen in 'Coriolanus.' . . . He also sought the tenderness and care of his daughter Judith and writes his later plays centered about her love and tenderness." With less scientific paraphernalia and with no more picturesque incorrectness, J. R. STRONG (*Note*, 1921), GREGOR (*Shakespeare*, 1935, p. 548), and, so MASON LONG (*Poetry*, 1938, p. 303) declares, "many" others have professed their allegiance to Mistress FITTON. But her day is past. TUCKER (ed. 1924, p. lii n.) finds her identification with the dark woman "amazing," KITTREDGE (ed. 1936, p. 1492) "impossible." The two adjectives express the feelings of most other writers at the present time; though GEORGE GORDON (*Airy Nothings*, 1917, pp. 35 f.) is probably right in saying, "Her name is forever linked with Shakespeare's."³

¹ In his *Christmas Garland*, 1912, pp. 81 f., MAX BEERBOHM, after burlesquing Harris's manner of dealing with "the whole gamut of women in whom Mary Fitton was bodied forth to us," admits that he rates Harris's views of Sh. "higher than those of all 'the Professors' together."

² PAR (*Vida de Guillem Sh.*, 1916, p. 22) rejected her case but created a ghost for Spain by twice calling her MARFA LITTON.

³ Fitton addresses a reproachful sonnet to Sh. in CAROLINE GILTINAN's *Veiled Door*, 1929, p. 27. She has been a favorite with playwrights who retell the sonnet story. She is the heroine, for example, of JOSEPHINE P. P. MARKS's *Fortune and Men's Eyes*, 1900; HARRIS's *Sh. and His Love*, about 1904; CLEMENCE DANE's *Will Sh.*, 1921; CHARLES WILLIAMS's *Myth of Sh.*, 1928. MARGARET C. MUNN's *Will Sh.*, 1910, on the other hand, features Southampton and

Before her exit, however, WILDE around 1890 (*Portrait of Mr W. H.*, 1921, pp. 97 f.) suggested that Sh.'s mistress "was probably the profligate wife of some old and wealthy citizen,"¹ perhaps (since dates did not worry him) even the heroine of Thomas Cranley's *Amanda: or, The Reformed Whore*, 1635. Then SARRAZIN (*Jahrbuch*, 1895, XXXI, 225-229), struck by what he believed to be contradictions in 130.9 f. and 141.5, surmised that the dark woman spoke melodiously but that her dialect was difficult to understand. As he was devoted to the (untenable) notion that Sh. had made a trip to northern Italy in the summer of 1592 (see the notes to 44), he next assumed that the dark woman, the Rosaline of *Love's Labor's Lost*, was an Italian, perhaps a Venetian. That is why the poet praises the black hair of his mistress as real in contrast to the artificial blond hair of other women. Sh.'s affair, because carried on abroad, is all the more excusable. Besides, the famed courtesans of Venice were cultured women musically inclined. About two decades later SARRAZIN (*Internationale Monatsschrift*, 1914, VIII, 1077 f.), keeping abreast of what is humorously called scholarship, dismissed in turn the claims of Fitton, Lady Rich, Mrs. Jane Davenant, and "the wife of a London innkeeper." He now favored "a woman of French or Italian descent" or else "a musically gifted Welsh-woman with black hair and black eyes," though her identification is unimportant. What really matters is (p. 1082) that "after years of privation, of bitter need, and of hard work, the outcast, the lonely one, is offered a short, intoxicating happiness in love by a gipsy-like, seductive woman. Certainly this was not the only passion of the actor, but at any rate it was the one which gripped him most deeply, so deeply that the memory of it conjured up, after fifteen years, an obviously life-like portrait of a courtesan in Shakespeare's Cleopatra."

Another dark lady—or dark horse—stepped from the pages of the chameleon-like VON MAUNTZ in 1903 (*Heraldik in Diensten der Sh.-Forschung*, pp. 275-325).² At the end of Gabriel Harvey's *New Letter of Notable Contents*, 1593, are added (Grosart's Harvey, 1884, I, 295) some bad and puzzling verses, "Gorgon, or the Wonderfull yeare," with an "enuoy" that mentions an unperformed "miracle," namely, "*The second Shakerley Rash-swash to binde.*" GROSART (1885, III, xii f., xv), following Bullen, explained these poems as meaning, "Marlowe is dead; it remains to muzzle Nashe." There follows (I,

VERNON, while H. H. HAY's *As Sh. Was*, 1934, calls the dark woman INEZ CIRCOVITCH, a beauty who yields to Southampton's seductive proposals after he has showered upon her sonnets written to order by Sh., and who then tempts the sonneteer, only to have him faint.

¹ JOHN BROPHY's novel, *Gentleman of Stratford*, 1939, calls her Mrs. NELL, niece of a London merchant Peter Fender, wife of an English merchant absent in Milan, and the mistress also of John Donne. Sh.'s "romantic love sonnets" are addressed (p. 371), not to Mrs. Nell or to Southampton, but "to a young woman for whom I invent no name beyond The Lady in Scarlet and White." It is this latter of Sh.'s two loves who arouses Sh.'s jealousy of Southampton. Fiction is no stranger than what many scholars assume to be truth.

² For his first choice, LADY MANIBETTER (or SWINESNOUT), see p. 56, above.

295 f.) "A Stanza declaratiue" which asserts, "*Pleased it hath a Gentlewoman rare, With Phenix quill in diamont hand of Art, To muzzle the redoubtable Bull-bare.*" Deeply impressed by the poems and Grosart's effort at explaining them, von Mauntz gave another explanation that he hoped would be found acceptable.¹ He observed that Harvey's *Pierce's Supererogation*, 1593, has various references to a gentlewoman, whom he equated with the "my Lady Smith" once mentioned in a parenthesis (Grosart, 1884, II, 313). He explains Harvey's words as indicating that this gentlewoman had a scientific education uncommon among Elizabethan ladies; that, as a patron of the arts, she had taken under her protection, to Harvey's disgust, a poet, and honored him with personal affection; that she was not beautiful, or rich, or of high rank; and that she had been disrespectfully treated by Nashe, and so joined with Harvey in attacking him in print. Grosart (III, xxiii f.) had identified the gentlewoman as the Countess of Pembroke. But the German writer was of another mind. His attention was attracted to the series of elegiac Latin poems that Harvey wrote during 1578 in memory of Sir Thomas Smith, of Saffron Walden, a once-famous knight who (Grosart, I, xii) "had interested himself from the outset in his poetic celebrator." Though the obvious deduction from the text of *Pierce's Supererogation* would appear to be that LADY SMITH was the wife of the dead Sir Thomas, von Mauntz imagines that she was only a relative, and that she was the dark woman, Harvey the rival poet. With these premises in mind, he gives a highly fanciful story. Lady Smith hated Nashe as much as she liked Sh. She is one of the "two loves" of 144, Southampton the other. In 1593 she was about thirty-six, an age that agrees well enough with the comments in the *P. P.* version of 138, "wherefore sayes my Loue that she is young?" In 33 the sun refers to Lady Smith, the region cloud to Harvey; 21 is a criticism of Harvey's mode of writing and 86 a personal attack on him. It would scarcely be worth one's while to give further details about this impossible candidate for the dark woman's fame. She has rightly been ignored since her creation in 1903.

STOPES (ed. 1904, pp. xxxii f.; see also the *Athenaeum*, March 26, 1898, p. 406), after hunting since 1890 for someone to displace Mistress Fitton, reached the conclusion that the black lady was "most probably . . . not a lady at all . . . but one of the rich citizen's wives, . . . a woman who had been married just long enough to feel a sense of *ennui* creep into her leisured life, and a desire for new conquests steal into her vain soul." Then, by one of those mental jumps which less agile scholars may well envy, she was reminded of Richard Field, the Stratford-on-Avon man, who published Sh.'s *Venus*, printed *Lucrece*, and married JACQUELINE VAUTROLIER, widow of the printer to whom he had been apprenticed.² Why could Sh. not have known and fallen in love with her—and why couldn't Southampton? Stopes was fair-minded enough to confess (see also *Sh.'s Environment*, 1914, p. 155) that she knew nothing whatever

¹ Recent explanations by T. W. BALDWIN and F. S. BOAS will be found in the *T. L. S.*, January 18, February 15, 1941, pp. 31, 79.

² On Field's life see STOPES, *Sh.'s Warwickshire Contemporaries*, 1897, pp. 3-11; H. R. PLOMER, in the *Bibliographer*, 1903, II, 174-188; A. E. M. KIRWOOD, in the *Library*, June, 1931, pp. 1-39.

against the morals of MRS. FIELD, who, however, "fulfilled all the necessary external conditions." Besides she was a Frenchwoman—and hence presumably dark of complexion and loose of morals.¹ SARRAZIN (*Aus Sh.'s Meisterwerkstatt*, 1906, p. 106) inclined towards the Stopes theory: "Might, perhaps, those people be right who regarded the Frenchwoman Jacqueline Vautrouillier [sic], who since 1588 had been married to the printer Richard Field, Shakespeare's publisher, as the original of the Frenchwoman Rosaline? At any rate Shakespeare was personally connected with Richard Field, since both were natives of Stratford-on-Avon. And there probably were not many citizens' houses in London that would then have stood open to the actor and made it possible for him to hear the lady of the house play 'oft' (cf. 128) on the virginals." WOLFF (*Jahrbuch*, 1908, XLIV, 126 f.) paid it the compliment of discussion and rejection. But Mrs. Field, with other shadows like herself, has now entirely faded from sight.

Among other suggestions perhaps that of VON KRALIK (*Kultur*, 1907, VIII, 396) deserves mention. He informs us that the dark woman, an accomplished musician, was Sh.'s mistress before he met Southampton. She flirted with the earl and was unfaithful to the poet. His anger is reflected in *Lucrece*. "The character of the dark mistress, who probably was named Rosaline, is reflected in various idealized figures among his female characters" in the plays.

The name of Sir William Davenant's mother was presented to an eager world far later than might have been expected, since the knight himself—who, however, reveals no knowledge of the sonnets—apparently enjoyed hinting that Sh. was his father, and, in the words of the seventeenth-century JOHN AUBREY ('*Brief Lives*,' ed. A. Clark, 1898, I, 204), "seemd contented enough to be thought his [Sh.'s] son." Stories to this effect were told and retold by the Restoration actor BETTERTON, by POPE, by WILLIAM OLDYS, and others. SKOTTOWE (*Life of Sh.*, 1824, I, 67 f.) and ELZE in 1869 (*Essays on Sh.*, 1874, pp. 316–318) referred to them, the latter deciding that "the possibility . . . of a relation between Shakespeare and Mrs. Davenant cannot be denied." Neither thought of identifying her with the woman of the sonnets. A step in the right—or wrong—direction was taken when FLEAY (*Chronicle History*, 1886, pp. 121–125) guessed that the dark lady was also set forth as AVISA in the cryptic *Willobie His Avis*a, of 1594, on which see Appendix XI, pp. 295–313, below.

In a series of articles and books ACHESON developed the Davenant theory (or theories, since he has two heroines of that name) with an enthusiasm and energy equaled only by his disregard for the laws of evidence. In *Mistress Davenant the Dark Lady of Sh.'s Sonnets*, 1913, he set forth his "discovery" that Avis of *Willobie His Avis*a (he makes no acknowledgment of Fleay's earlier pronouncements), the dark woman, and MRS. JANE DAVENANT are identical, but he professed (p. 177) disbelief in the traditional scandal that made Sh. the father of Sir William. Then in a pamphlet called *A Woman Coloured Ill*, 1913 (p. 5), he announced new evidence establishing "beyond the possibility of doubt" Mrs. Jane's identity with Avis; but it turns out to consist only

¹ STOPES (ed. 1904, p. 225) suspects in "those Iackes that nimble leape" (128.5) a "double meaning . . . for 'Jacqueline Field.'"

(p. 8) of the presence in the first thirteen letters of a commendatory poem prefixed to *Willobie* ("In Lavine Land t") of the phrase "Ill In [= Jn = Jane] Davenant." Jane Shepherd, of Durham, it may be said here, married John Davenant around 1601, and their fourth child, later Sir William, was baptized on March 3, 1606.

TANNENBAUM (*Dial*, 1914, LVI, 494-497) demolished Acheson's work, in which "not one" of the alleged discoveries "has a particle of evidence to support it." Just so ALDEN (*J. E. G. P.*, 1915, XIV, 460) declared that the Davenant story has "failed to find acceptance with a single competent student of the Sonnets"; MAX FÖRSTER (*Jahrbuch*, 1914, L, 205) pointed out that it is "presented dogmatically, without proof, and confused by very dubious conclusions"; and GEORGE GORDON (*Airy Nothings*, 1917, p. 36) dismissed it as "the merest cobweb-spinning." None the less, Acheson created a stir. BERNARD SHAW (*Misalliance*, etc., 1914, pp. 103 f.) admitted that if he had "wished to be up to date" in his little play, *The Dark Lady of the Sonnets*, he would have adopted the suggestion, not of Tyler about Fitton, but of Acheson that the "lady" concerned "kept a tavern in Oxford and was the mother of Davenant the poet." An eager convert, also, was DE CHAMBRUN (*Giovanni Florio*, 1921, pp. 117-121).

While various uncritical reviewers, a few credulous commentators, and fewer literary artists were hastening to adopt ACHESON's findings, he pursued his researches and discovered (*New York Times Book Review*, March 20, 1921, pp. 4, 27; *Sh.'s Sonnet Story*, 1922) that Jane Davenant was *not* Avis and the dark woman, but that such an honor, or dishonor, belonged to her supposititious predecessor, John Davenant's first wife Anne. That hypothetical personage he described as the supposed daughter of William and Anne Sachfield, of Bristol, but actually an illegitimate child of Mrs. Sachfield by William Bird, alderman and once mayor of Bristol. Anne Sachfield ("née Bird") Acheson assumed to have married John Davenant, with whom she helped run the Tavern (much later called the Crown Tavern) at Oxford. There Southampton and Sh. sought her favors, and were for a time repulsed, but later they had their way—the way of a man with a matron. Eventually MRS. ANNE DAVENANT, deserted in London, became the mistress of Southampton's Italian tutor, John Florio, by whom she had a son; and shortly thereafter she died. The "second" Mrs. Davenant, Jane, the blameless mother of John's seven children, was slandered by Betterton, Aubrey, Oldys, and the rest because of the gossip that centered around her (non-existent) predecessor's misdeeds.

LEE (*Year's Work*, 1923, p. 74), remarkably enough, asserted that Acheson has "good ground" for believing that John Davenant's "first wife was Anne Bird, daughter of a Mayor of Bristol." But neither of Sir William Davenant's recent biographers takes Acheson seriously. ALFRED HARBAGE (1935), indeed, relegates his books to a footnote (p. 10 n.), where he disposes of "the chimerical theory that the Oxford vintner [John Davenant] had a first wife who was the Dark Lady of Shakespeare's sonnets." A. H. NETHERCOT (1938) goes into details to make clear that Mrs. Jane was John Davenant's first and only wife, that Mrs. Anne is the figment of a vivid imagination. He remarks justly (p. 430) that "the conclusions and identifications of Acheson are purely circumstantial—one of the most remarkable farragos of documentary fact and

spun-sugar imagination ever created outside the great Bacon-Shakespeare conundrum."

One has difficulty in following "MRS. DAVENANT" after 1922, since generally it is impossible to tell whether the real Jane or the imaginary Anne is meant. POEL (*T. L. S.*, June 2, 1921, p. 356) definitely inclined to the acceptance of Mrs. Anne as the dark woman, suggesting that the sonnets dealing with her were written for Southampton and his friends; but shortly thereafter C. E. NEWBON (the same, June 16, p. 389) gave reasons for rejecting the new theory of Acheson, whose "account and speculations . . . are not reliable." MATHEW (*Image of Sh.*, 1922, p. 109) calls 135 and 136 humorous poems perhaps addressed to Sh.'s "friend, Mrs. Davenant," who "had a will of her own and a child christened William"—a statement hardly appropriate to "Mrs. Anne."¹ DE CHAMBRUN, in her novel *Two Loves I Have*, 1934, adds to the confusion by making Anne the only wife of John Davenant, who on one occasion remarks (p. 306): "Nan sayeth that the dark lady will never be known, and doubts whether she ever really existed outside of Will's imagination." Here the countess rejects the scandalous story of Sh.'s intrigue with "Mrs. Davenant"; yet in her misnamed book, *Sh. Rediscovered*, 1938, she endorses (pp. 159-162) the theory that Mrs. Davenant (presumably the imaginary Anne) is the dark woman, but expresses some doubts whether "the scandal" about her and Sh. "was justified by the facts." FRAYNE WILLIAMS (*Mr. Sh.*, 1941, p. 213) also appears to believe that Sh. "was involved with both the wives of innkeeper Davenant," though he admits not knowing what was "the complexion and colouring of either of the two landladies." The most recent solver of riddles, ALDEN BROOKS (*Will Sh. and the Dyer's hand*, 1943, pp. 135, 171, 284), says that Acheson is probably right about Anne Bird Sachfield Davenant as the dark lady, and he contributes the strange information that she is described as Diamante in Nashe's *Unfortunate Traveler*, 1594. In that novel the reader (pp. 178-182) "is . . . given a burlesque narration of Southampton's wooing of his former mistress. And Nashe swears to his narrative, 'saint Anne be our record'." No doubt Acheson's fuzz of words will mislead others in the future. For all that, MRS. DAVENANT, whether Jane or Anne, has had her one crowded hour of glorious life; but the clock has told her time, and she deserves and receives no consideration from informed readers.²

Poor Sh., not to mention Southampton, comes off badly at the hands of HARRISON, who in 1933 (*Shakespeare*, p. 64) dogmatically said that the dark

¹ Anne Davenant is featured in ELIZABETH GOUDGE's short story, "The Dark Lady," *Good Housekeeping*, November, 1938, pp. 28-31, 205-212 (reprinted in her *Golden Skylark*, 1941, pp. 154-176).

² It is somewhat amusing to find PIERCE BUTLER (*Materials*, 1930, p. 45) rejecting "Mrs. Davenant" partly for the reasons that she "is not known to have been dark and that she was not of the class called lady." His reviewer, KELLER (*Jahrbuch*, 1933, LXIX, 167) adds: "Shakespeare does not call his dark lady beautiful, at least according to Renaissance concepts; but the report transmitted by Betterton [he refers to and quotes John Aubrey's '*Brief Lives*,' ed. A. Clark, 1898, I, 204] expressly calls Mrs. Davenant 'a very beautiful woman'." Neither comment applies to Acheson's Mrs. Anne.

woman "was a courtesan, notorious to fashionable young gentlemen of the Inns of Court who took their pleasures in Clerkenwell; and for a time Shakespeare became her lover. . . . By ordinary standards the woman was not beautiful, yet irresistibly fascinating." The "lady," he suggests (pp. 310 f.), was a negro prostitute, probably the "*Lucy Negro, Abbess de Clerkenwell*," mentioned in the *Gesta Grayorum* of 1594 (Malone Society reprint, 1914, p. 12). HARRISON repeated this suggestion (ed. 1938, p. 122) five years later, by which time the damage was done; for FRIPP (*Shakespeare*, 1938, I, 263), with no reference to him, calmly asserts, as if the matter were proved, that LUCY NEGRO, abbess of Clerkenwell, was one of the whores, familiar companions of the poet, on whom Sh. modeled the dark woman. Thus seventy-seven years after the German translator Jordan had provided a negro mistress for Sh., two distinguished Englishmen, adopting and expanding his ideas, assigned her a name and an excessively squalid locale.

From the negro madam one turns, almost with pleasure, to more or less esoteric explanations that involve, not personalities, but abstractions, allegories, or generalized ideas. Those of BARNSTORFF (1860), HERAUD (1865), RICHARD SIMPSON (1868), KARPFF (1869), and others have been referred to elsewhere (pp. 157-165, above). Heraud's notable conclusion (*Shakspeare*, 1865, p. 501) that Sh. wrote the sonnets with the Bible before him perhaps deserves a second mention: in them the poet "is in fact reading the Canticles; and there he finds the Bride who is 'black but comely'—at once the bride of his Celestial Friend and his own." CARTWRIGHT (*Papers on Sh.*, 1877, p. 18) emulates Barnstorff and Heraud by urging that the dark woman is "the *Sonnet-muse*, with black hair because she is an Italian, the sonnet having its origin in Italy."¹ According to WIGSTON (*New Study*, 1884, p. 69 n.) in the sonnets love "had not a mortal being for its object, but an unrepresentable spirit of beauty, the true source of *artistic births*." A much more imaginative interpretation is supplied by DOWNING (*God in Sh.*, 1890), whose opinion is that, in addition to representing abstract ideas like error and lust, she is (p. 135) "the destiny of Falstaff. . . . They are united in a celestial or infernal marriage, in the bonds of the abstract"—whatever that may mean. Not unnaturally Downing (see also pp. 159 f., above) could find (p. 15) in a *Hamlet* colon "a brilliant core of light, darting its rays in all directions, rolling back doubt and darkness," and in Sh. "a Holy Prophet," "the Messiah." Beside this, CONSTANCE HOPE's description (*Month*, 1899, XCIV, 42) of the dark woman as Sh.'s "lower nature, his 'female evil'" sounds commonplace, though JOHN HUTCHINSON (*Baconiana*, April, 1912, p. 93) repeats it. Meanwhile SIMONE ARNAUD (*Nouvelle revue*, 1891, LXXI, 537) had assured her readers, "There is no need to search for the woman's name. Shakespeare has written it in one word: it is Perfidy!"

COURTHOPE (*History*, 1903, IV, 45-47), like many before and after him, notes the woman's resemblance to Cleopatra, but he then conjectures that both are "an impersonation of 'the fleshly lusts which war against the soul.'" Accord-

¹ In *Footsteps of Sh.*, 1862, p. 158, CARTWRIGHT had characterized her as an "amorous tigress," who "must have been an Italian, of some rank, the wife of one of the merchant princes of Venice at least, or the Ambassadors herself, if not the wife of an English nobleman."

ing to DE MONTMORENCY (*Contemporary Review*, 1912, CI, 739, 741) she is an allegorical figure representing "Death and Evil," or, better, "death in the soul. . . . Man *does* love her; that . . . is the dreadful fact . . . that Shakespeare was destined to exhibit in its hideous nakedness in tragedy after tragedy." ORD's comment (*Chaucer & the Rival Poet*, 1921, p. 25) is lacking in clearness: in 127-154 "there is a strong animadversion on the evils of sensual love. In my opinion no particular woman is actually referred to: the descriptive epithets, mostly referring to darkness . . . appear to me to only indicate the moral quality of a person in the abstract of such a character as indicated." But only too clear is FORBIS (*Shakespearean Enigma*, 1924, p. 151), who conceives of Sh. as a dipsomaniac writing 127-154 (except for 128, which [p. 153] "is actually addressed to a woman") to his black mistress "Wine—Wine in its debasing or degrading character." The conflict in the dark-woman sonnets, declares WOLFGANG SCHMIDT (*Anglia*, 1938, LXII, 297), "is a conflict in the soul of man: lust versus truth. . . . The external opposing forces in human existence (*Time, Death, Fortune*) no longer play any part. The inner world, protected by *true love* against external forces and influences, is threatened in its own domain. *Love* and *Truth* have succumbed to chaotic forces, since love has refused the advice of the physician 'Reason'." The conflict here expressed is finally solved (pp. 299 f.) in *Troilus and Cressida*.

Mistress Fitton, the Mmes. Davenant, Lady Rich, and the rest sometimes reappear, sometimes are displaced by assorted rivals, in works by the anti-Stratfordians. A few mirthful illustrations follow.

G. S. CALDWELL (*Is Sir Walter Raleigh the Author of Sh.'s Plays and Sonnets?*, 1877, pp. 29-31) attempts to clear up the mystery by saying that "Sh.," or Raleigh addressed "a large number of the Sonnets" to QUEEN ELIZABETH and four (71-74) to LADY RALEIGH—as well as one (37) to Prince Henry. This elucidation fails to appeal to ROBERT PALK (*T. L. S.*, October 24, 1918, p. 512). As he explains, 40-42, 133, 134, 144 "relate that their author [Raleigh] was the 'Dark Lady's' lover until supplanted by a friend, to whom he voluntarily gave way. . . . He accuses the friend of having been corrupted by her; and Sidney early in 'Astrophel and Stella' (S. xiv.) deprecates a like accusation made by some friend of his." Palk suggests that after Sidney's death (1586) Raleigh-Sh. renewed his affair with LADY RICH. It was unhappy, and he then wrote most of the dark-woman sonnets. It was these attacks on his sister that aroused Essex's enmity towards Raleigh in 1587-1591. The latter in 1591 began to woo his future wife (Elizabeth Throgmorton), dropping his association with Penelope, whereupon his relations with Essex improved.

To STOTSSENBURG (*Baconiana*, October, 1892, pp. 53-61; see also his *Impartial Study*, 1904, pp. 244-249) "Sh." is a pseudonym of Sir Philip Sidney; and, accordingly, he welcomes Stella, or LADY RICH, as the dark woman. To her 127, 128, 130-132 "clearly refer," and Sidney intimates "that Dyer had supplanted him in her affections." W. THEOBALD (*On the Authorship of the Sonnets*, 1896, pp. 15-27) repeated and expanded Stotsenburg's revelations. He finds Stella in 40 and 127-152, and her married name in 135.11 ("thou being *rich* in will"). In 40.1 Sh. tells her, "Take all my loues," that is, both my friends, Dyer and Fulke Greville. She accepted at least part of this liberal invitation, so that Dyer fell "captive to the fascinations" she exerted. The

"confin'd doome" of 107 refers to her marriage to Lord Rich, the "subbornd Informer" of 125 to a spy hired by that cuckold.

BLEIBTREU (*Lösung der Sh.-Frage*, 1907, pp. 97, 116 f.), an adherent of Roger Manners, fifth Earl of Rutland, as author of the sonnets, insists that the dark woman, who must have been with "Sh." constantly from 1598 to 1609, was the earl's wife, ELIZABETH SIDNEY (daughter of Sir Philip), "Essex' stepdaughter, a lady not only of the highest rank, but also of great reputation as a gifted scholar and poetess. . . . Lady Sidney was also a cousin of Pembroke (editor of the Folio), with whom Rutland was joined in the Essex conspiracy." Why such a lady (the *D. N. B.* says she married Rutland "early in 1599," the *Complete Peerage*, 1895 [VI, 465], about March 5, 1599) merited the abuse accumulated in 138, 144, and 152 is not made clear. But by 1923 BLEIBTREU (*Sh.s Geheimnis*, p. 48) had "divined out of a thousand reasons that the adored friend of heavenly beauty means merely conception and inspiration, to be sharply differentiated from the capricious, coy 'Muse,' the 'dark lady,' who is the product of art. She does not always want to do what the Genius demands; she is not wholly equal to his divine ardor."¹ From these latter opinions of his acknowledged master, LANDAU (*Sh.-Mysterium*, 1930, pp. 132 f.) dissents. "It would hardly have been worth while to discover a personal Shakespeare [in Rutland] only to reveal him as a god without passion, surrounded by abstract symbols." There are two "ladies" in the sequence—the dark siren of 138, 144, and others, and the enchanting blonde of 97–99, 145. The picture given of the latter, "so different from the lustful, tyrannical dark mistress," was likely inspired by Elizabeth Sidney, the poet's bride.

The Baconians agree only to disagree. Thus HOSMER (*Bacon and Sh. in the Sonnets*, 1887) makes the black woman a mere personification of Tragedy. REICHEL (*Sh.-Litteratur*, 1887, pp. 460–464) discovers in Q the romance of ELIZABETH and Essex. He is not sure how intimate Bacon was with the queen, but no matter, for (p. 461) he would put nothing beyond "that sycophantic, obsequious place-hunter, that friend of everybody, who trims his sails to any wind." Fifteen years later (*Gegenwart*, 1902, LXII, 250 f.) REICHEL, although he has altered his views about the authorship (see p. 44, above), still identifies the dark woman as Elizabeth. T. W. WHITE (*Our English Homer*, 1892, p. 277) is sure that Bacon wrote some of the sonnets "to Lady Hatton, during his suit to her; but his wife Alice must certainly be the object of those which culminate in CLII." In this latter notion PARKER WOODWARD (*Tudor Problems*, 1912, p. 322) concurs: the sonnets after 126, particularly 132, 138–140, 142 are Bacon's record of "his unrequited love for the young wife [Alice Barnham] he married in 1606." Again (p. 295), "132 and onwards" tell "the story of the elderly husband's deep affection not met with the *réciproque*, but *per consequence* with inward and secret contempt." Just as confidently W. H. BURR (*Baconiana*, October, 1892, p. 94) equates the black heroine with Sidney's widow, for it is "highly probable that Bacon was one of her admirers, aye, even one of her lovers"—which is hard on LADY SIDNEY-ESSEX. To CONSTANCE M. POTT (the same, August, 1893, p. 68) the dark woman typifies

¹ L. F. BOSTELMANN (*Rutland*, 1911, p. 12) echoes, she is "Rutland's erratic and tyrannical 'Muse' that plays with his genius."

nothing but "False Philosophy," but DUGGAN (*Fair, Kind, and True*, 1896, pp. 8, 170) has the most delightful explanation of all. "The woman in black . . . is not an actual person, or an immoral mistress, although the love of the Poet. She is the projected Folio of 1623, and is figuratively, or typically, addressed as his [Bacon's] Love—the Drama." 130 "is a personified pen picture of the First Folio [1623], describing the style of binding, the color of the edges of the leaves and of the paper itself, the shape and form of the letters, and even the perfume from the ink of that time." EAGLE (*Baconiana*, October, 1914, pp. 218-226; *New Light*, 1916, p. 57) makes our elusive heroine the "*personification of Fortune*," later adding (*Quest*, 1925, XVI, 515) that Sh. borrowed certain ideas about her from Fortuna in Chaucer's *Romaunt of the Rose*. The contribution of RICE (*Story of Hamlet*, 1924, pp. 370 f.) is that Bacon "always writes of some ideal or entity—sometimes addressed as a man, sometimes as a woman, sometimes as a man and woman combined." But these ideal persons have a flesh-and-blood background. The man friend (pp. 379 f.) is Sir Philip Sidney, "who, occasionally appearing in the Sonnets as a 'tertium quid,' forms the third side of a mysterious triangle." The second side is formed by ANNE CECIL, later COUNTESS OF OXFORD, who (pp. 450-462) is the real heroine of *Astrophel and Stella*. She is addressed (pp. 388 f.) in 1-40, Sidney first appearing in 41 and 42. The emphasis on her blackness refers only to the ink (pp. 392 f.) in which Bacon writes about her (see 63.11, 65.14). This last revelation—that the lady actually was fair (p. 395), though described in black ink—may give new courage to followers of Mary Fitton, all the more so since Lady Oxford died in 1588, two years after her alleged lover Sidney. ROE (*Sir Francis Bacon's Own Story*, 1918, pp. 20-22), WANSCHURA (*Sonette Sh.s*, 1930), and DODD (*Personal Poems of Francis Bacon*, 1931) are typical of a numerous band who think Bacon wrote many of the sonnets to his mother, QUEEN ELIZABETH, pleading with her for recognition.¹ If she actually read them, small wonder that she refused publicly to recognize her all-knowing natural son.

LOONEY ("Sh." *Identified*, 1920, p. 449), the father of the "Sh."-Oxford theory, remarked that the dark woman "presents a problem not yet solved, and [*sic*] which may remain unsolved for all time." He had too little faith in his disciples. It seems hardly cricket for RENDALL (*Sh. Sonnets*, 1930, p. 284) to say, in emulation of his master, that the dark woman "was an actual person," but that, "happily, there are no clues for identification." One cannot help feeling that, since he is trying to displace Sh. by Oxford, he is morally obligated to identify her. But the loss is small, for PERCY ALLEN (*Case for Edward de Vere*, 1930, pp. 142, 145) shows her to be Oxford's second wife, ELIZABETH TRENTHAM, who is written of "with anger and contempt." PHILLIPS (*Tragic Story of Sh.*, 1932) agrees that the second Countess of Oxford is the dark woman—as she is also (p. 133) the Venus of "Sh.'s" first poem. Fertile imagination has revealed to him that Oxford (p. 123) had an illegitimate son by a "little western flower" who "was probably one of the ladies of the Court." Indeed there is a "possibility" (pp. 124-126) that he had actually married her before he married Anne Cecil in December, 1571, or that he "turned to

¹ Wanschura, however, informs us (p. 14) that the poet is identical with the dark woman, that she represents his sensual or animal soul. See pp. 164 f., above.

her when, in 1576, he found his wife had played him false." Anne died in June, 1588, and the little flower's son, Will, began (pp. 130 f.) to act in Oxford-Sh.'s plays during 1588-1589. But, alas, father and son were estranged by the former's marriage in 1591 to Elizabeth Trentham, the dark woman. Young Will (p. 133) promptly made love to her, while the earl wrote (pp. 108-114) 127, 132-134, 137-142, 144, and 152, "pleading with her to give up his son," and the latter addressed her (pp. 106 f.) in 135, 136, and 143. Henry, eighteenth Earl of Oxford, born on February 24, 1593, was the offspring of this more or less incestuous relationship; but Oxford and his son were soon reconciled, although the dark-lady countess "seems neither to have desired forgiveness nor to have deserved it." PHILLIPS repeats this rigmarole¹ in *Sunlight on Sh.'s Sonnets*, 1935 (p. 13): "The story . . . is that of a father [Oxford] who loved his son [Will], and whose son [the same Will] betrayed his [Oxford's] love." It reveals "a disgraceful amour" between "a wife [Trentham] whom the poet had just married" and her stepson, himself the offspring of an entirely hypothetical union with an unknown woman, not the poet's first wife, and so on. But none of this demonstration convinced C. W. BARRELL, who in a series of strange articles in 1941-1942 (*Sh. Fellowship News-Letter*, volumes III, IV) made the dark woman Oxford's mistress Anne Vavasour.

The illustrious dead, regrettably enough, cannot defend themselves against the libels of impossible possibilities. But surely it is a greater strain on one's credulity to picture Bacon, Raleigh, Sidney, or the Earls of Oxford and Rutland consorting with tavern-keepers' or printers' wives, mulatto prostitutes, or even little western flowers than to picture (if one must picture) a common actor-playwright like Sh. so doing. A research student who has ploughed through these records of human gullibility sighs with relief to come across HARVEY WICKHAM's *jeu d'esprit*, "Did Sh. Murder His Father?" (*Catholic World*, 1932, CXXXIV). In the best Freudian manner Wickham argues (pp. 538 f.) that "the infant Shakespeare loved his mother, and wanted to get his father out of the way." He, Hamlet-Sh. (p. 545), suffering from a mother-complex or fixation, could not love another woman (Ophelia) well enough to marry her. Hence (p. 546), "we know now who the 'dark lady' was, and why she was kept dark."

¹ That is, if GERALD PHILLIPS and G. W. PHILLIPS are, as the Library of Congress assumes, one person.

APPENDIX X

THE RIVAL POET

Nine of Sh.'s sonnets, 78–86, MINTO (*Characteristics*, 1874, p. 289) declared, "are occupied with the pretensions of other poets, and one poet in particular, to the gracious countenance of his patron." Most commentators would eliminate 81, as some would 84, from this list (though a few have added others to it), and many would, like Minto, acknowledge that more than one rival is mentioned. In 78 Sh. refers to alien pens dispersing "their" poetry for his friend's patronage, or delectation; in 82 to the dedicated words which "writers" use, the strained rhetoric "they" have devised, and "their" gross painting; in 85.5, 13 to "others" who write good words. On the other hand, only one poet is singled out in 79, 80, 83 (that is, if Sh. is one of "both your Poets"), 85.7, and 86. There is, then, no obvious reason why a singular rival poet should be preferred to plural rival poets. Especially definite is 78.3 f.: "euery *Alien* pen hath got my vse, And vnder thee their poesie disperse." A. HALL, indeed, says (*N. & Q.*, July 12, 1884, pp. 21 f.) that "the rivals are legion," among them being Drayton and Marlowe; and again (August 9, p. 102) that Marlowe may be referred to in 80, 85, and 86, "Peele, Nash, Lodge, Drayton, Chapman, Ric. Barnfield, Barnaby Rich, and such like being the compeers, the lately deceased Robert Greene . . . the affable familiar ghost."

The presence of more than one rival, indeed, is widely recognized. FLEAY (*Biographical Chronicle*, 1891, II, 59, 65, 218–220) named Harvey and others as the rivals. WYNDHAM (ed. 1898, pp. 251–258) was sure that "there were more rival Poets than one," although one is singled out in 21, the same, or another, in 79.4 and 80. No one rival can be identified, but, in any case, "Jonson, Chapman, Marston, and Drayton constituted a society for mutual admiration, whose members applauded each other's efforts, whilst they ignored, burlesqued, or patronised Shakespeare's." STOPES (ed. 1904, pp. xxxvi f.) asserted that "the chief rival was probably Chapman," but other "alien pens" were Barnes, Markham, and Nashe. "Many other poets, and would-be poets, crowded round such a desirable patron [Southampton], but his heart returned to Shakespeare, the love of his youth." BEECHING (in Bullen, ed. 1907, p. 371) saw two rivals: "Sonnet 82 clearly refers to more than one. . . . In 78 they seem to be distinguished as the poet who has 'learning' and the poet who has 'grace.' If this is so, the one is described in 85 as writing . . . [with 'goulden quill']; the other in 86 as distinguished by 'the proud full sail of his great verse.' Perhaps they are contrasted again in 79 and 80." He suggested Daniel for the poet of "grace," Chapman for the other, but admitted that "the question cannot be settled."

In addition to plurality, various other factors complicate the matter. Thus long ago WHITE (ed. 1865, p. 151) announced that the rival poet (singular) wrote verses about a female, not a male, friend, and that 80, 83, 85, 86, 121 "were evidently written to be presented to some lady who had verses addressed to her by at least one other person than the supposed writer of these,"

while the female recipient of 78 was "the theme of many pens." Not much different was the asseveration of R. M. THEOBALD (*Baconiana*, February, 1894, pp. 190 f.) that Queen Elizabeth is the subject of 78-86 (see p. 249 n., above), in which Sh. refers satirically to the "loquacious poetasters who filled her ears with flattery and pandered to her appetite for praise." BEECHING (in Bullen, ed. 1907, p. 365) interpreted Sh.'s complaint as "not that the friend extended his patronage to a rival, but that he took pleasure in this rival's flattering verses; and this is not the same thing." KNIGHTS (*Scrutiny*, 1934, III, 137) considered the sonnets (78-86) dealing with the rival poets (plural) "compliment and complaint, at once courtly and ironic." Obviously if the poems in question are ironic, sarcastic, or playful, their testimony should not be taken literally.

But, ignoring such complications, the majority of writers have confined their discussions largely to the identity of one great rival and to the sincerity of Sh.'s complimentary references to him. It is because, perhaps only because, of this assumed sincerity that the rival has aroused such great interest. Sh. speaks of him as "a worthier pen" (79.6), "a better spirit" to whom he is "inferior farre" (80.2, 7); "the proud full saile of his great verse" and the fact that he has been taught by spirits "to write, Aboue a mortall pitch" (86.1, 5 f.) are commented on. If these remarks were sycophantic or ironical, then they might as well apply to Thomas Deloney or any other vulgar ballad writer—in ALDEN's words (ed. 1916, p. 477), to "an ambitious nobody destined for oblivion." If they are, as is usually assumed, expressive of Sh.'s real opinions, it is difficult to find any Elizabethan poet to whom they seem applicable. But, after all, there was a recognized Elizabethan convention of modesty. Writers deferred to it by characterizing their brains as base and barren, their wits feeble, their verses trifling. There is no reason why Sh. should not have followed it, even if the rival, or rivals, he had in mind (or imagination) were far inferior to his own saucy bark.

The impossibility of establishing any identification of Sh.'s rival (the singular may be used for convenience) has discouraged few seekers for the truth. Just as Bacon has been proved the author of almost everything written in the Elizabethan period, so the rival has been equated with nearly all the prominent poets, and some not prominent, of his day and earlier. But the question of his identity is nearly always answered in accordance with the writers' preconceived ideas of what the sonnet story means, or of who the man friend and, sometimes, the dark woman were, or of when the poems were composed. As soon as the shadows of Willie Hewes or Hughes, Southampton, Pembroke, Fitton, and two Mrs. Davenants, or the Spanish Armada fall across the page, the wary reader anticipates special pleading—the sort of pleading from which, unluckily, no scholar is totally free. There are no moral or legal deterrents against setting forth one's beliefs that such and such a poet aroused Sh.'s apprehension or disdain, though evidence is a different matter. Doubtless at any moment we may expect a thousandth book or article, demonstrating that the rival poet was Richard Stanyhurst, Anthony Munday, Joshua Sylvester, or even Homer, Virgil, Petrarch, Ronsard, or Desportes.

Judging frankly on the score of poetic merit, MALONE (ed. 1780, p. 645) wrote: "Curiosity will naturally endeavour to find out who this *better spirit* [of 80] was, to whom even Shakspeare acknowledges himself inferior. There was

certainly no poet in his own time with whom he needed to have feared a comparison; but these Sonnets being probably written when his name was but little known, and at a time when Spenser was in the zenith of his reputation, I imagine he was the person here alluded to." There was no love lost between Malone and GEORGE CHALMERS, yet the latter (*Apology*, 1797, p. 63; *Supplemental Apology*, 1799, pp. 38-42) received this suggestion with enthusiasm, giving a long list of supposed or real parallels between the sonnets and the *Amoretti*, and arguing that Sh. wrote his sequence in frank emulation of SPENSER. DYCE (ed. 1832, p. 189 n.) contented himself with saying that the "better spirit" of 80 "has been supposed to mean Spenser," a poet whom FULLOM (*History of William Sh.*, 1862, pp. 300 f.) and BODENSTEDT (Sh.'s *Sonette*, 1866, p. 214) likewise supported with assertions. GERTRUDE GARRIGUES (*Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, 1887, XXI, 256) remarked, with some truth, that Spenser "is the only poet of the time of whom it is likely" that Sh. could show jealousy. She was echoed by J. M. (*Sh. Self-Revealed*, 1904, pp. 67 f.): Spenser was "the only contemporary poet of whom Shakespeare could be jealous, on account of the quality of his work, without showing great lack of judgment." Almost nothing new was presented by DE MONTMORENCY in 1912 (*Contemporary Review*, CI, 737-742, 885-889) except his eccentric belief that, like *The Faery Queen*, the sonnets are an allegory. MATHEW (*Image of Sh.*, 1922, pp. 94-97) asserted that while Spenser was in London during 1589-1590 "it would have been natural" for him to meet Southampton, Sh.'s patron. He may have written poems, now unknown, in honor of that earl or have depicted him as one of the knights in *The Faery Queen*. The "affable familiar ghost" of 86.9 is perhaps a reference to Spenser's lost *Dreams* or else to his inspiration from Chaucer, the "most sacred happie spirit" of *The Faery Queen*, IV.ii.34. That great poem is referred to in 106.

It would be gratifying if SPENSER could be proved the rival poet, but his claims to that honor are slight, his supporters few.

The candidacy of SAMUEL DANIEL was announced in 1837 by BOADEN (*On the Sonnets*, pp. 46-56), the "codiscoverer" of Pembroke as the friend, his chief reasons being that Daniel was reared at Wilton, the seat of the Pembrokes, and that in 1602 he dedicated to Pembroke the *Defense of Rime*. These "dedicated words," as 82.3 discloses, aroused Sh.'s jealousy. Other points are that Sh. imitated *The Complaint of Rosamond* in *Lucrece*, that his sonnets "were equally founded upon" *Delia*, and that his allusions to ghosts and spirits were suggested by Daniel's familiarity with the astrologer, Dr. John Dee, likewise a protégé of the Pembroke family. Years later, BEECHING (ed. 1904, pp. xlv f.) demolished Boaden's case for the reasons "(1) that as Daniel had been tutor to William Herbert, Shakespeare could have no ground for resenting their relations; (2) that there is no evidence of Daniel's having had dealings with familiar spirits; and (3) that the dedication to the *Defence of Ryme* is in prose and contains no passage that could be censured as 'gross painting' (82.13)." If Mr. W. H. was not William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, Beeching concedes, these objections lose their force; and "the description in 85 of the 'precious phrase by all the Muses filed' applies as well to Daniel as the 'proud full sail of his great verse' does to Chapman; and Daniel's *Musophilus* (1599) is written in praise of learning." In advocacy of Boaden's opinions, CREIGHTON (*Sh.*'s

Story, 1904, pp. 32 f.) proclaimed "that the rivalry was really to gain Lord Herbert's interest with the Queen in filling up the office of Poet Laureate with its substantial pension, vacant on the death of Spenser" (1599). He supplied details; for instance, that "*Alien*" (78.3) "is an anagram of Daniel all but the D," while "under thee" (78.4) "is under the Rose, *sub rosa*, privately," which "may explain the fact that no series of sonnets by Daniel to Lord Herbert are printed in his works." As Polonius might have said, "That's good!"

If any real evidence were forthcoming, DANIEL, an excellent poet, would make a fitting rival. None has yet been produced, and the *D* is still *sub rosa*.¹

COLLIER (ed. 1843, p. 475 n.) remarks that PETER CUNNINGHAM believed 21 "an apparent allusion to Drayton," but that "it may be doubted whether" here or in 80, 83, 85, and so on Sh. "had any individual reference." Then in 1861 JORDAN (*Sh.'s Gedichte*, p. 1) fancied that "the long-forgotten" DRAYTON might have been the subject of Sh.'s words. Why he should be called "long-forgotten" does not appear, nor does any evidence. But he has had various advocates, among them BEKK (*William Sh.*, 1864, p. 72) and LEGIS (*N. & Q.*, August 26, 1876, pp. 163 f.; see also March 31, 1877, pp. 244 f.). The latter assumed that Sh.'s jealousy was aroused by the "songs or hymns" of the *Poly-olbion* (1613, 1622), his knowledge of which "may have been limited to mere hearsay, or the loud talk and praises of its admirers." FLEAY (*Biographical Chronicle*, 1891, II, 219 f., 232), greatly impressed by Sh.'s supposed borrowings from Drayton's sonnets, decided: "If the slightest external evidence were forthcoming of any connexion between Drayton and Southampton, so that we might identify Drayton with the second poet of Sonnet 83, not a difficulty in the interpretation of the whole series would remain unsolved." Just so WYNDHAM (ed. 1898, pp. 251 f., 258), though convinced that the rival who is "singled out" cannot "be confidently identified," admitted: "If compelled to select one of Shakespeare's contemporaries for the Rival Poet, I should select Drayton." EAGLE (*Baconiana*, October, 1914, pp. 227-230; *New Light*, 1916, pp. 42-48) also favored Drayton, because he and "Sh." have the same "main theme." The spirits, or "compiers," of 86 are referred to in *The Barons' Wars*, 1603, IV, 39 (*Works*, 1932 ed., II, 78),—"To write those Plagues . . . Doth aske a Pen of *Ebon*, and the Night; If there be Ghosts, their Murthers that be-moane, Let them approach me,"—but, boiled down, Eagle's argument rests on the undeniable fact that here and in I, 4 Drayton uses the word *night*. NEEDHAM (*T. L. S.*, October 12, 1933, p. 691) supplies further details of the same sort. The opening lines of *Piers Gaveston*, 1594 (1931 ed., I, 159), explain the meaning of 86. They run:

From gloomy shaddowe of eternall night,
Where cole-black darknes keeps his lothsome cel,

¹ In spite of Creighton's article in the *T. L. S.*, January 23, 1919, p. 46. There he refers to a British Museum copy of Daniel's *Panegyric Congratulatory*, 1603, which "has a special title-page . . . enclosed or 'reserved' in a border of gilt scroll-work. . . . If this was what Daniel was 'wont' to do in dedications, we should understand the joke of 'comments of your praise richly compil'd' and 'reserved' with a 'goulden quill,' while 'precious phrase by all the Muses fil'd' would be a pun and joke upon Daniel's 'Musophilus.'"

And from those Ghostes, whose eyes abhorre the light,
From thence I come a wofull tale to tell:

Prepare the Stage, I meane to acte my parte,
Sighing the scenes from my tormented hart.

From *Stygian* lake, to gracelesse soules assign'd,
And from the flood of burning *Acheron*,
Where sinfull spirites are by the fier refinde,
The fearefull Ghost of wofull *Gaveston*:

With black-fac'd furies from the graves attended,
Untill the tenor of my tale be ended. . . .

O purple-buskind *Pallas* most divine
Let thy bright fauchion lend me Cypresse bowes,
Be thou assistinge to this *Poet* of mine,
And with thy tragicke garland girte his browes,
Pitying my case, when none would heare me weepe
To tell my cares hath layde his owne to sleepe.

Of the foregoing passage Needham remarks: "This seems to satisfy all the conditions implied in . . . [86], and moreover accounts for the use of the word 'compiers.' . . . The 'precious phrase by all the Muses fil'd' . . . is matched . . . by an invocation of the Muses in P. G. verse 5," while "the learned's wing" (78.8) "might well have been used of Drayton even in 1594." But on flimsy reasoning like this nearly any of the *Mirror for Magistrates* poets might be proposed for Sh.'s rival. None the less, NEWDIGATE (*T. L. S.*, November 9, 1933, p. 774) approved Needham's words. He appended the information that in 86.9 f. Sh. "certainly seems to be having a thrust" at Drayton's *Piers Gaveston*, lines 1717 f. (1931 ed., I, 206), "My ghost now hence to *Ankor* shall repayre, Where once the same appeared unto thee," and that the "ghost" disappears in later editions of Drayton's poem.

But DRAYTON, too, deserves no serious consideration.

MARLOWE's pretensions to the rivalry were set forth rather early. CARTWRIGHT (ed. 1859, pp. 8 f.) insisted that Sh. could not have had in mind Spenser, who was living in Ireland, or Daniel, whose verse has no proud, full sail. "Marlowe is the man . . . ; the familiar ghost, Mephistophiles; Marlowe was also just the splendid and dissipated character to dazzle and lead the young lord [Southampton] astray"—ideas repeated by CARTWRIGHT in *Footsteps of Sh.*, 1862 (pp. 154 f.). MASSEY (ed. 1866, pp. 134-151) designated Marlowe "the rival poet,"¹ though at the same time he identified "heauie ignorance" (78.6) as JOHN FLORIO, who dedicated his *World of Words*, 1598, to Southampton, and "Alien pen" (78.3) as NASHE, whose "hand was against every man," and whose *Unfortunate Traveler*, 1594, was patronized by Southampton. In his 1888 edition (pp. 159-174) he insisted even more strongly upon Marlowe, although, meantime, MINTO (*Characteristics*, 1874, p. 290) had counter-

¹ Massey's (anonymous) remarks in the *Quarterly*, 1864, CXV, 446-448, converted F.-V. HUGO (Sh.'s *Œuvres*, 1865, XV, 320-322) to Marlowe. To the latter's "rivalry" SANFELICE (Sh.'s *154 sonetti*, 1898, pp. 21-23) added unimportant flourishes of his own.

attacked: "The insuperable objection to Marlowe is that he died in 1593; and even supposing Southampton to have been Shakespeare's patron, we have no evidence of their acquaintance prior to 1593, and there is no evidence that Marlowe was acquainted with Southampton at all." Objections like these made no impression on WILDE (*Blackwood's*, 1889, CXLVI, 15) or GODWIN (ed. 1900, pp. 199 f.). Marlowe, the latter wrote, "was at the height of his popularity" when Sh. came to London. His plays had "changed the aspects of the drama." Sh. knew him, and twice refers to him in plays. The two men collaborated in writing *Henry VI*. Some of Marlowe's couplets were "sung by the boatmen of the Thames as they rowed along the wharves." Such "evidence" is, in a sense, refreshing.

WOLFF (*Sh.'s Sonette*, 1903, pp. xvi f.) maintains that the details given in the sonnets fit only Marlowe: "Possibly he had approached Southampton shortly before his sudden death and had intended to make his uncompleted, posthumous poem *Hero and Leander* an offering of homage to the young earl." C. C. B. (*N. & Q.*, March 9, 1912, p. 190) accepts Butler's early dating of 107 as 1588, and hence places 1-107 in the years from 1585 to 1588. In the latter year Marlowe and Sh. were, he says, twenty-four. The former, the only possible rival, is finely described in 86, and his familiar ghost is Mephistopheles in *Dr. Faustus*—a play composed, says U. M. ELLIS-FERMOR (*Christopher Marlowe*, 1927, p. 4) in "the latter part of 1588, or the earlier part of 1589." But CONRAD (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, 1919, CLXXVII, 230 f.) interprets the familiar ghost of 86 as an obvious allusion to Marlowe, who had in *Hero and Leander* copied Sh.'s style and ideas—a somewhat unorthodox inversion of chronology. SNIDER (*Biography*, 1922, pp. 371-373) and ALEXANDER (*Sh.'s Life*, 1939, p. 95) also fix on Marlowe, without producing anything original in support of their choice. That deficiency is supplied by the new and strange details of L'HOMMÉDÉ (*Revue de Paris*, 1923, II, 173; *Secret de Sh.*, 1932, pp. 25 f.), who backs Essex as the fair friend. Marlowe, we read, was lame, a fact mentioned by Sh. in 37.9, 89.3, and 121.11. Stranger still is the fantasy of PHILLIPS (*Lord Burghley in Sh.*, 1936, pp. 202-204, 241),¹ who presents to our sightless view three Sh.s: "the great SHAKESPEARE [Oxford]: Will. Shakespeare, his [supposititious] son: William Shakspeare, the dummy." While the great Sh. was writing sonnets to "Will," a group of rivals was, as is told in 53, 68, 82, 85, and elsewhere, composing *Venus* as a series of "lascivious descriptions" of "Will" to which Sh. "strongly objected." Meantime, "'Will' was fraternizing with, and patronizing these wits, who were . . . writing about him. In doing this, they imitated and travestied some of the *Sonnets* (but by no means all of them): and when they had finished their poem (to which he may have contributed) he put his name to the dedication of it." Marlowe, the chief of these poets, was assisted by GREENE, PEELE, KYD, NASHE, and CHAPMAN; and their poem *Venus* "was a product of the tavern—perhaps of the Mermaid Tavern."

As pretenders to the rival's throne SPENSER and MARLOWE figure in some odd combinations. CONRAD (*Jahrbuch*, 1884, XIX, 241) formerly believed that both were featured in the sonnets, since they contended for the favor of the

¹ For further illumination of the rival Marlowe see PHILLIPS's *Sunlight on Sh.'s Sonnets*, 1935, pp. 75-77.

friend, Essex. The reasons he gave (pp. 246-251) may be commended to the attention of students of research methodology. Spenser, the most famous English poet, had dedicated a sonnet to Essex, and probably intended to represent him as Prince Arthur in *The Faery Queen*. The two men were very friendly in 1590-1591. The ghost of 86 is satisfactorily explained as the hobgoblin mentioned in Harvey's letter of 1580 (Grosart's Harvey, 1884, I, 95), where in reference to Spenser's apparent decision to abandon his "*Nine Comædies*, whereunto . . . you giue the names of the *Nine Muses*," Harvey remarks: "If so be the *Faerye Queene* be fairer in your eie than the *Nine Muses*, and *Hobgoblin* runne away with the Garland from *Apollo*. . . ." If this proof is insufficient, then ponder 78.1-4, Sh.'s complaint against Marlowe's plagiarism in *Hero and Leander* from both *Venus* and the sonnets.

A worthy rival commentator, MACKAY (*Nineteenth Century*, 1884, XVI, 248-252), thought it certain (see pp. 47, 92, above) that Marlowe actually penned many of the sonnets. Thus of 80, "Marlowe might have written this justly of Shakespeare, but Shakespeare could not justly have written it of Marlowe, or any other contemporary poet." In 82 "'Both your poets' could have been none other than Shakespeare and Marlowe." Again, 86 shows "how highly Marlowe, the generous and unenvious writer, . . . admired and appreciated" Sh. Though Mackay substitutes declaration and personal opinion for evidence, the upshot of his discussion is that SH. is the rival poet. Such, too, is the belief of JESSE JOHNSON (*Testimony*, 1899, pp. 54, 97-99), of STRONACH (*N. & Q.*, October 3, 1903, p. 275),¹ and of FORREST (*Five Authors*, 1923, p. 216). The latter has found (see p. 48, above) that the contents of Q were written by Sh. and four others, and "one pleasing result" of the discovery is that the rival poet, the great artist praised in 80, 85, and 86, is Sh. himself. These three sonnets, because of their confused thought and sloppiness, are, with a curtsy to Lee, assigned to BARNABE BARNES.

The great name of BEN JONSON was, not unnaturally, presented early, but has met with small favor. J. G. R. (*N. & Q.*, February 12, 1859, p. 125) believed that 78, 80, "and some other sonnets" refer to him. ALGER (*Christian Examiner*, 1862, LXXIII, 426-428) observed that "a series of six or eight sonnets express the author's jealousy of several other poets, one in especial, who sought to win his friend away and monopolize him." Ben is probably the especial one. Are not the figures of ships in 80 ("proudest saile," "sawsie barke") exactly like those Thomas Fuller—years later—used in describing the wit-combats of Jonson and Sh. at the Mermaid, "like a Spanish great galeon and an English man-of-war"? To Pembroke, the friend of the sonnets, Jonson dedicated his *Catiline*, 1611, and his *Epigrams*, 1616; while "in the fire which [around 1622] destroyed so many of Jonson's papers other poems addressed to Herbert may have perished, poems answering to Shakespeare's 'Every hymn that able Spirit affords' [85.7]." It is queer that so few writers have adopted Alger's views, for Jonson would be a worthy rival—one no modern would be ashamed to recognize as deserving Sh.'s eulogies. KATE HILLARD (*Lippincott's*, 1875, XV, 506) did remark that the case for him, though "still conjectural," is the strongest yet made out; while DUGGAN (*Fair, Kind, and*

¹ See pp. 290 f., below.

True, 1896, pp. 113-123), a Baconian, noted various references to him in 78-86, as in 78, where he "probably is introduced . . . to show his knowledge of French." BEECHING (ed. 1904, pp. xlvii f.) says that if the choice, as WYNDHAM (ed. 1898) infers, lay among Jonson, Chapman, Marston, and Drayton, "a claim might be put in" for the first, "who was becoming known about 1597. . . . But there is no evidence that he dabbled in necromancy." FORBIS (*Shakespearean Enigma*, 1924, pp. 99, 263, 268), however, discovers references to spirits of the material, not the supernatural, world. The rival-poet sonnets are addressed to wine and "also, it is believed, refer to Ben Jonson." The latter is the better spirit of 80, since he "never speaks of wine but in the most exaggerated praise." In the *Poetaster* Jonson slurred at the dipsomania of Sh., who thereupon wrote 67-70 in retaliation. But in 78-80, 82-86 his tone is one of admiring friendship.

A bare mention of HENRY BROWN's hypothesis (*Sonnets of Sh.*, 1870, pp. 183-194) will suffice: that one rival is FRANCIS DAVISON, whose dedicatory sonnet to Pembroke in the *Poetical Rhapsody* of 1602 is referred to in 78 and 82; and that the other is JOHN DAVIES, of Hereford. An "argument" typical of Brown is that the line, "Leane penurie within that Pen doth dwell" (84.5), refers to Davies's occupation as teacher of penmanship.¹ GROSART, editing Davies (1878, I, lvi) with justice says that Brown's theory is "un-reason embodied," that he "is ludicrously ignorant equally of the facts and of the poetry of Davies."

MINTO (*Characteristics*, 1874, pp. 290-292), the first to suggest CHAPMAN, thought Sh.'s praises were not seriously intended: "Chapman was a man of overpowering enthusiasm, ever . . . advancing fervent claims to supernatural inspiration." His *Shadow of Night*, 1594, "goes far to establish his identity with Shakespeare's rival," for in the dedication he says (*Poems*, 1941, p. 19) that knowledge "will scarcely be lookt vpon by others but with inuocation, fasting, watching; yea not without hauing drops of their soules like an heauenly familiar." "Here we have something like a profession of the familiar ghost that Shakespeare saucily laughs at." Sh. lays stress on compeers by night, a nightly ghost. "Chapman's poem is called the 'Shadow of Night,' and its purpose is to extol the wonderful powers of Night in imparting knowledge to her votaries." Then "as regards . . . the proud full sail of his great verse, that applies with almost too literal exactness to the Alexandrines of Chapman's Homer, part of which appeared in 1596" (or rather 1598), and in a later edition sonnets in honor of both Southampton and Pembroke were included. Chapman's chief patron was Sir Philip Sidney's father-in-law, Sir Francis Walsingham, who naturally would have introduced him to Pembroke. No one "will think that his 'proud sail' has been unduly honoured by the affected jealousy and good-humoured banter of the 'saucy bark' of Shakespeare."

These comments obtained a glowing endorsement from FURNIVALL (ed. 1877, p. lxxv n.), who contended that 86.1 "probably alludes to the swelling

¹ MASSON (MS. *Autobiography of Sh.*, 1846, II, 74-109) had argued at length for Davies, noting that 85 refers to the latter's remarkable penmanship and to the artistic fashion in which he sent forth the poems he addressed to his friends and patrons.

hexameters of Chapman's englishing of Homer," 86.5 "to Chapman's claim that Homer's spirit inspired him, a claim made, no doubt in words, before its appearance in print in his [*Euthymiae Raptus; or The Tears of Peace*, 1609" (*Poems*, 1941, pp. 174 f.): "I am (sayd hee [Homer]) that spirit *Elysian*, That . . . did thy bosome fill, With such a flood of soule; that thou wert faine (With acclamations of her Rapture then) To vent it, to the Echoes of the vale; . . . and thou didst inherit My true sense (for the time then) in my spirit; And I, inuisible, went prompting thee." To Minto's comparison of 86.9 f. with the dedication of *The Shadow of Night* Furnivall added a parallel with *The Tears of Peace* (the same, p. 194): "Still being perswaded (by the shamelesse light) That these are dreames, of my retired Night; That, all my Reading; Writing; all my paines Are serious trifles; and the idle vaines Of an vnthrifitie Angell, that deludes My simple fancie." DOWDEN's opinion (ed. 1881, pp. 19 f.) was that "the poet remains as dim a figure as the patron," but that the best guess at his identity was Minto's. The latter's guess was characterized by SHARP (ed. 1885, Introductory Note, p. 28) as "conclusive" and by TYLER (ed. 1890, p. 33) as "so complete as to leave no reasonable doubt on the matter," while VERITY (ed. 1890, p. 402) "unhesitatingly" adopted it. So, too, did GOLLANCZ (ed. 1896, pp. x f.) and BOAS (*Sh. and His Predecessors*, 1896, p. 120). WYNDHAM (ed. 1898, pp. 254 f.) and LEE (*Life*, 1898, pp. 134 f.) were opposed. The former noted that Chapman's sonnets to Pembroke and Southampton are but two out of the sixteen appended to his *Iliad* (1611) and acknowledging the patronage of various ladies and gentlemen. To be sure, Chapman's references to his "aduenturous Barke" in verses added to the *Odyssey* would fit 86, but they were not written until 1614. Lee dismissed Chapman, who "had produced no conspicuously 'great verse' till he began his translation of Homer in 1598; and although he appended in 1610 [*sic*] to a complete edition of his translation a sonnet to Southampton, it was couched in the coldest terms of formality, and it was one of a series of sixteen sonnets each addressed to a distinguished nobleman [*sic*] with whom the writer implies that he had no previous relations."

Then just as COURTHOPE (*History*, 1903, IV, 33) was speaking of "the extremely flimsy evidence" for Chapman, ACHESON (*Sh. and the Rival Poet*, 1903, p. 14) professed to "show conclusively" that "Chapman's identity as the 'rival poet' is absolutely true," only to find out that in speculative research standards of absolute truth differ from writer to writer. But in 1904 HESSEN (*Leben Sh.'s*, pp. 206 f.), without producing any evidence of his own, joined Chapman's train. So, likewise, did BRANDL (*Sh.'s Sonette*, 1913, pp. xvi-xviii), who, according to WOLFF (*E. S.*, 1916, L, 159), is merely following Acheson. Unmoved by this sly dig, BRANDL in 1922 and 1937 (*Shakespeare*, p. 147) reiterated his views, insisting again that 86 points definitely to Chapman, "who in 1594 boasted of such strange assistance in the preface to his highly pathetic meditative poem 'The Shadow of Night.'" Meantime, KELLER (*Sh.'s Werke*, 1916, XV, 515) had denied the presence of any allusion to Chapman in 86.10 or of any parody in the whole sonnet: Sh. is in "bitter earnest."

It will be observed that no details of any importance were produced for forty years after Minto first broached his theory, although the mere impact of reiteration was impressive. Chapman made great strides over Lee's candi-

date Barnes, and indeed began to be spoken of by dozens of authorities as the rival. In 1917 he was given powerful support by ROBERTSON (*Sh. and Chapman*, pp. 14-16), who rested his case very largely on 85.6-8 with its reference to "euery Himne that able spirit affords." The words are alleged to be directed at Chapman's *Shadow of Night*, which "consisted of two Hymns; and 'able' is an epithet often used by Chapman." Furthermore, in the dedication of *Hero and Leander*, 1598, the poet says (*Poems*, 1941, p. 132) that he was "drawne by strange instigation" to finish Marlowe's work, and in his opening sestiad (III. 183-187) he speaks of communing with "spirits." Besides, there is a striking resemblance between 86.5 f.—especially "Aboue a mortall pitch"—and a passage (occurring in the 1609 edition) of the *Iliad*, II. 419-421 (*Works*, 1875, III, 35), "that great work, unless the seed of Jove, The deathless Muses, undertake, maintains a pitch above All mortal powers." In his *Problems*, 1926, (pp. 231 f.), ROBERTSON summarized his brief for Chapman: "The reason for the common preference given to Chapman as chief 'rival poet' is that he at most points *does* fit the descriptions in Sonnets 80 and 86. The chief objection thus far made is that the 'proud full sail of his great verse' can be said to begin only in 1598, with the issue of the first portion of his translation of the *ILIAD*. But, in the first place, the cited phrase might quite as well be applied to the style of his *SHADOW OF NIGHT* (1594) divided into two 'Hymns,' or of his *OVID'S BANQUET* (1595), as to any other verse by any possible rival poet above named [pp. 227-231]; and, in the second place, it is in a high degree likely that portions of Chapman's *ILIAD* were in circulation in MS. as early as 1594. In tracing the evidence that points to him as 'taught by spirits to write' we shall have to examine his continuation of Marlowe's *HERO AND LEANDER*; and the beginnings of *that* performance, which is not unlikely to have been started even as early as 1593, may also have been known to Southampton's circle, and might very well in turn be regarded as carrying 'proud full sail.' " ROBERTSON (*Sh. and Chapman*, pp. 19 f.) was absolutely certain that nobody but Chapman can meet "the characteristics set forth in Sonnet 80, which seems to tell not only of Chapman's mystical claims but of the verse of his translation of the *ILIAD* . . . 1598, but probably seen in manuscript" by Sh. before that date.¹ He clinched his argument by "proving" (pp. 20-95) that the *L. C.* with its "perverse diction, the *concetti*, the uncommon vocabulary, the strong lines and the bad lines, nay, the final futility" was written by the rival poet—not the unknown versifier favored by Mackail (see p. 293, below) but Chapman himself.

Opinions about the adequacy of Robertson's demonstration have been decidedly mixed. Thus POOLER (ed. 1918, p. xxv) replies: "If 'that able spirit' was Chapman it is not easy to believe that Shakespeare wrote in good faith of his 'precious phrase by all the Muses filed' or of the 'polish'd force [*sic*] of' his 'well refined pen.' There are fine passages . . . in Chapman, but refined and polished are among the last epithets one could apply even to these. Again, Chapman nowhere claims intimacy with a familiar spirit. What he

¹ Chronology does not worry DOUGLAS, who says (*True History*, 1933, pp. 167 f.) that the rival of 86 "is perhaps Chapman," though he follows Butler in dating 86 in the spring of 1586.

tells us in *The Shadow of Night* is that the true student is pale with thought, and spends in thinking the time that others spend in sleeping and eating. This he illustrates by the popular belief that the devil draws blood from a witch. . . . It is no proof that Chapman was intimate with Herbert or Southampton in 1597, to say that he addressed sonnets to them appended to his *Iliads of Homer* in 1609-11. These sonnets are accompanied by a dozen others addressed to different people and did not appear at the earliest till 1609. . . . [Their tone] is cold and impersonal, a circumstance that in no way supports the conclusion that Chapman had twelve years before written flattering and affectionate poems to either Southampton or Herbert. Nothing in his writings is in favour of the supposition that at any time he wrote such poems to anyone. The word 'hymn' was used of poems by Spenser, Drayton, and Barnes, as well as by Chapman." BULLEN (*Sh.'s Sonnets*, 1921, pp. 6 f.), also unconverted, was content to remark that "possibly some day may be discovered a letter or diary of some friend of Shakespeare's, written about the time of the publication of the Sonnets and identifying Mr. W. H., the Dark Lady and the Rival Poet. More probably the mystery will never be solved."

But ACHESON, in a mass of assertions too elaborate to be summarized, wrote *Sh.'s Sonnet Story*, 1922, with the blissful self-delusion that thereafter nobody could possibly dispute Chapman's identification with the rival. A typical specimen of his evidence is the confident remark (p. 280) that Sh.'s "All touns (the voice of soules)" (69.3) is an allusion to Chapman's lines in *Ovid's Banquet of Sense*, 1595 (*Poems*, 1941, p. 81), "Alas why lent not heauen the soule a tongue? Nor language, nor peculier dialect?" Acheson's development of the Chapman theory is so bound up with identification of the friend as Southampton and the dark woman as Mrs. Anne Davenant (who never existed) as to deprive it of any value for persons who wish facts instead of fancy.¹

MURRY in 1927, however, became (*Countries of the Mind*, 2d series, 1931, p. 124) an eager disciple of Robertson and Acheson. "It surely is hardly possible," he insists, "for any one to read through Chapman's early poems with an open and careful mind without coming to the definite conclusions first, that he is the poet hit off . . . [in 86.9 f.] and, second, that Chapman is, in his poems, incessantly girding at a successful rival poet who has established himself in the favour of a nobleman by poems which Chapman condemns as sensual." Such remarks are scarcely flattering to the hundreds of readers who have not reached these conclusions, and who doubtless supposed their minds to be "open and careful." But Murry goes on to make (pp. 124 f.) an original contribution by calling attention to lines in the second hymn of *The Shadow of Night* (*Poems*, 1941, p. 34), "Presume not then ye flesh confounded soules, That cannot beare the full Castalian bowles, Which seuer mounting spirits from the sences, To looke in this deepe fount for thy pretenses," where "the change of 'ye' to 'thy' betrays that Chapman is hitting at an individual;

¹ A reviewer of Acheson's *Sh. and the Rival Poet*, 1903 (*Spectator*, 1903, XCI, 872), made the impressive suggestion that 21.14, "I will not prayse that purpose not to sell," "which probably is proverbial, may contain a reference to Chapman's name, . . . [and mean,] 'That is a Chapman's way of praising, not mine.'"

and . . . the whole passage will bear no meaning save as an angry reference to the ['pocula Castalia'] couplet of Ovid . . . which is the superscription of Shakespeare's *Venus*." BUSH (*Mythology*, 1932, pp. 200 f. n.) also quotes these verses, which seem to him "a clear allusion" to the motto of *Venus*, and which "read like the protest of a mystic and moralist against a leader of the fleshly school." He thinks that Sh. good-naturedly replied to them in 86.9 f.

To RIDLEY (ed. 1934, p. x) and HARRISON (ed. 1938, p. 118) Chapman appears "the most probable" and the "likeliest" rival. A similar opinion is held by H. L. R. EDWARDS (*T. L. S.*, June 20, 1935, p. 399) and by FRANCES A. YATES (*Study of Love's Labour's Lost*, 1936, p. 184). The latter thinks that *Love's Labor's Lost* was "a contradiction of Chapman and that there was a kind of argument or rivalry between Shakespeare and Chapman during these years [1595-1597]." BROOKE (ed. 1936, p. 297) comments on 86.5-10: "It is bound to remind students of the peculiarities of Chapman: (1) The gorgeous and rather overdressed quality of his really 'great verse'; (2) His belief in spirits, or, at any rate, telepathy, indicated in the dedication and the opening lines of his portion of *Hero and Leander*; (3) His sometimes inhuman rhodomontades and obscurity,—writing 'above a mortal pitch'; (4) The special cult of night in his early poems; (5) His extravagant dedications of poems and even plays to persons of rank; witness that of the early books of his Homer to Essex."

Finally, in 1938 with a condescending assurance exasperating to non-believers, MURRY (*T. L. S.*, June 4, pp. 385 f.) described Minto's theory, "elaborated later with great ingenuity . . . by Mr. Arthur Acheson," as "almost a necessary instrument of Elizabethan literary criticism. The more one reads both in Shakespeare and in Chapman, the more self-evident it is." He asked whether scholars might not "now take it for granted that the rival poet is Chapman." I myself can see no reason for taking such a notion for granted. It may or may not be true, as KITTREDGE says (ed. 1936, p. 1492), that "Chapman is the most popular candidate, but his popularity is waning." But the words of ALDEN (ed. 1916, p. 477), written some twenty-five years ago, seem to me to apply just as strongly now as ever: "This Chapman theory, while it is far from having been shown to be impossible, has been accepted with decidedly uncritical assurance. . . . For the present, at any rate, DOWDEN's conclusion [ed. 1881] must stand: 'In the end we are forced to confess that the poet remains as dim a figure as the patron.'"

In 1875 FLEAY (*Macmillan's*, XXXI, 438 f.), possibly inspired by the comments of MASSEY (ed. 1866, pp. 137-140), brought forth the name of THOMAS NASHE, who "dedicated many [*sic*] works to Southampton" before 1596, and who "was probably Shakspeare's earliest enemy." He later withdrew this suggestion, but it was recently set forth by STALKER (*Sh. and Tom Nashe*, 1935) in a series of imaginary talks between Coleridge and Lamb.

One of the most novel and far-fetched literary theories ever evolved, namely, that DANTE was the rival poet, an anonymous writer presented in 1884-1886 (*Blackwood's*, 1884, CXXXV, 727-761; 1885, CXXXVII, 774-800; 1886, CXXXIX, 327-350). A fair sample of his reasoning is this: Sh. calls the rival a "spirit," thus showing (p. 728) "that he was not a living contemporary." Again (pp. 735-737), the "compilers by night" (86.7) are Homer, Virgil, Horace, and others; the "affable familiar ghost" (86.9) is Beatrice. When Sh. (p. 752) "thinks of Dante's verse—the hymns of the 'golden quill' or of the 'polished

and worthier pen'—the songs and praises of 'that able spirit,' that other and 'better spirit,'—his own verse is astonished." So far as I know, the only person whom this essay seriously impressed was CONSTANCE HOPE (*Month*, 1899, XCIV, 34-45).¹

FLEAY (*Biographical Chronicle*, 1891) veered like a windmill in discussing the rival, so that it is hard to determine what he really did believe. Thus he insists (II, 58 f., 218-220) that GERVASE MARKHAM "was one of the rivals of Shakespeare along with Chute [!] and Marlow"; that "no other candidate . . . yet proposed by others has nearly so good a claim." For Markham's lost *Thyrsis and Daphne*, 1593, was "no doubt" written in rivalry of *Venus*; his poem on Sir Richard Grenville, 1595, "was dictated by the 'spirit' of Grenville," the ghost of 86; "he was 'learned,' had 'proud sail' with a vengeance"; and in his play (with Lewis Machin), *The Dumb Knight*, 1608, he ridiculed *Venus*. In the midst of this disputation Fleay remarks that HARVEY, PEELE, BARNES, and FLORIO "may be included under 'every alien pen,' 78: the 'better spirit' is much more likely to be Gervase Markham," who was "at any rate one of the alien pens alluded to." But he concludes with the statement that he would prefer DRAYTON instead if he could find any work dedicated to Southampton by that poet. ROBERTSON (*Sh. and Chapman*, 1917, pp. 17 f.) thought it worth while to argue against Markham, who was not "learned," and whose verse has no "proud full saile." "Sonnets 80 and 86 point to some greater poet than he." Besides, his allusions to *Venus* imply no ridicule or hostility.

Another tentative candidate of FLEAY's (*Biographical Chronicle*, 1891, II, 65 [compare 218]) was GABRIEL HARVEY—of all poets. Discussing the lines, "Slumbring I lay . . . When . . . some *Familiar Spright*, Buzzed an *Epitaph* into my hed," which occur in a "Postscript" to a "Sonnet" appended to *A New Letter of Notable Contents*, 1593 (Grosart's Harvey, 1884, I, 296), he remarks: "The 'Familiar Sprite' who buzzes Epitaphs into Harvey's head as he lies in bed before the dawn, and gives him the false news that Marlow died of the plague, is surely the 'familiar ghost . . . ' of . . . 86; and if so, this identifies Shakespeare's rival . . . with Gabriel Harvey." This mental aberration—pooh-poohed by HALE MOORE (*S. P.*, 1926, XXIII, 351)—is worth mentioning, because it led VON MAUNTZ (*Heraldik in Diensten der Sh.-Forschung*, 1903, pp. 275-330) to back Harvey. His contribution is that 21 is a criticism of Harvey's mode of writing, and that the "region cloude" of 33 means Harvey, on whom in 86 Sh. makes an obvious attack.

By a stroke akin to genius G. A. LEIGH (*Westminster Review*, 1897, CXLVII, 173-187) hit upon the truth, long hidden from vulgar comprehension, that the rival was TORQUATO TASSO. "The term 'alien' [78.3] . . . points to a foreigner. . . . A long-standing jealousy existed among the literary men with regard to the hold upon the Court of Italian literature and customs." High above all others stood Tasso (died 1595), who "was possessed by the remarkable delusion that he was in daily communion with a familiar spirit." The patron common to him and Sh. was Queen Elizabeth. In *Of Marriage and Wiving*, 1598 (really 1599), translated and expanded from Tasso² by R. T., the latter

¹ A. H. (*N. & Q.*, August 15, 1885, pp. 126 f.) calls it "a literary hoax."

² Most of this pamphlet was written by Torquato's "deare Cosin," ERCOLE

comments (sig. L2) on the queen's virtues as "being like a soundlesse Ocean that hath no bottome." Sh. speaks of it in 80.10 as "your soundlesse deepe." She had urged Sh. to write "a great national poem in her honour." He delayed, as 83 apologetically confesses, and in 81 he laid "aside for ever the design" because Tasso had finished the *Jerusalem Delivered*, 1581, 1593. Scipio Gentili's Latin translation of the first canto, London, 1584, was dedicated to her, as was also Fairfax's complete translation of 1600, which took Sh. and "the reading world . . . by storm." By accepting this dedication the queen had recognized the greatness of Tasso. Sh. "professes his inability to do better, and the matter ends." As a further demonstration (p. 186 n.), "Hearing you praised, I say 'tis so" (85.9) is a play on Tasso's name: "such a covert pun" is "eminently after Shakespeare's manner." Leigh's thesis was, I suppose, familiar to CONWAY (*Supernatural in Sh.*, 1932, pp. 32-34), who, at any rate, adds verbal embroidery to it. In 79-81, Conway asserts, Sh. writes to Southampton and refers to LYLly as his rival; but 86 speaks of Tasso, who "was infested by delusions" and "was especially the poet of the sea"; 82-87 were written for Lord Oxford, "the greatest lover of Italian Tasso." "Both your Poets" of 83 means FLORIO and GOLDING.

Probably the most widely known theory about the rival was advanced by LEE, and no doubt hundreds of readers of his biographies in the *D. N. B.* and elsewhere accept it as a firmly established fact that the rival was BARNABE BARNES. That personage, LEE said in 1898 (*Life*, pp. 132-134), "was presumably a new-comer in the literary field who surprised older men of benevolent tendency into admiration by his promise rather than by his achievement. . . . All the conditions of the problem are satisfied by the rival's identification with the young poet and scholar Barnabe Barnes, a poetic panegyrist of Southampton and a prolific sonneteer, who was deemed by contemporary critics certain to prove a great poet. . . . Thomas Churchyard called Barnes 'Petrarch's scholar;' . . . Gabriel Harvey bade him 'go forward in maturity as he had begun in pregnancy,' and 'be the gallant poet, like Spenser;' Campion judged his verse to be 'heady and strong.'" In his *Parthenophil and Parthenophe*, 1593, Barnes included a sonnet to Southampton, praising the latter's eyes, and in 78 Sh. "sorrowfully pointed out" that these eyes teach "heauie ignorance aloft to flie,"—which, one might think, is not very complimentary to Barnes. Again, in 85 the word *Himne* is significant, for Barnes twice applies it "to his poems of love." The nautical metaphors in 80 are inserted with reference to "Barnes's identical choice of metaphor" in his sonnet 91.

When Lee said that "all the conditions of the problem" were satisfied by Barnes, he meant that they were satisfied in his own mind. Other minds have been less receptive. The queerest thing is that Lee, with his literary-exercises theory of the sonnets, thought any effort at identification necessary. Here he is far less consistent than WOLFF, who (compare pp. 152 f., above) makes all the sonnet personages conventional and imitative. Few people, indeed, have accepted Lee's notion. STRONACH (*N. & Q.*, August 22, 1903, pp. 142 f.),¹ to be sure, did so—with a difference: NASHE, MARKHAM, CHAPMAN, and

TASSO. It was licensed for publication (Arber, *Transcript*, 1876, III, 140) on March 6, 1599.

¹ See p. 283, above.

BARNES were striving for Southampton's patronage when in 1593-1594 Sh.'s two poems appeared; "the four poets were fairly cut out, and retired from the field," but Barnes expressed his resentment in 86. The "compilers by night" are "the players with whom Shakespeare associated and acted," the "affable familiar ghost" is the "'spirit' which supplied Shakespeare with his material for the dramas, or . . . the ghost in 'Hamlet.'" Somewhat similar (see p. 48, above) is FORREST's opinion, while HELENE RICHTER (*Sh. der Mensch*, 1923, pp. 70 f.) followed Lee implicitly. "In this race for the patron's favor," she says, "Barnabee [*sic*] Barnes, a mediocre sonneteer, but well practised in the art of flattery, seems to have been Shakespeare's most dangerous rival," and "it is not without the irony of a tragic retribution that he [Sh.], descending from the heights of his dramatic creativeness into the depressions of fashionable poetry, was beaten out by a journeyman sonneteer."

The case (such as it is) for Barnes depends entirely on Southampton's being recognized as the friend. CONRAD (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, 1919, CLXXVII, 226-228) confesses his inability even to imagine that Sh. would have so demeaned himself before a poet whom COURTHOPE (*History*, 1897, II, 305 n.) called "this idiot." Such an idea must have struck many other readers—especially those who agree with ECCLES (in C. J. Sisson, *Thomas Lodge*, 1933, pp. 239 f.) that "anyone collecting examples of how not to write poetry would find Barnes a treasure-house. . . . Many of his poems are pure dross, and no one of them is free from it." If Barnes—by 1598, as Eccles (pp. 175-191) shows, a poisoner and jail-bird—actually was the rival, then Sh. could hardly have been serious in praising his verse. Those who date the sonnets around 1598 and later should be almost as pained to find Barnes the rival as Lucy Negro the black woman.

WALSH (ed. 1908, p. 271) thought the pleas for Chapman nullified by the lack of any "external testimony that Chapman courted the favour of either of Shakespeare's known patrons," Southampton or Pembroke. The patron, indeed, might have been a woman like the COUNTESS OF PEMBROKE, and "the question about the rival poet is bound up with the question about the patron." Somewhat surprisingly, he then concedes that BARNES or SPENSER may be the poet referred to in 78, CHAPMAN in 86.

In 1906 SARRAZIN (*Aus Sh.'s Meisterwerkstatt*, p. 106) mentioned the various claimants for the rival poet's role, and decided that possibly GEORGE PEELE may be indicated. He had praised the Earl of Southampton in *The Honor of the Garter*, 1593 (Bullen's Peele, 1888, II, 329), and in *Anglorum FERIAE*, 1595 (the same, II, 351). "It is noteworthy that the poet, when he speaks of his rival, regularly accentuates the letter *p* by means of alliteration (in 78, 79, 84, 85, 86, for example). Shakespeare, so it seems, knew Peele's *Honour of the Garter* very well, as can be seen from reminiscences. At that time George Peele, indeed, was still regarded as an important poet, 'primus verborum artifex,' as Nash had called him." But Sarrazin's words fell from the press still-born.

Equally unimportant was the contribution of W. C. HAZLITT (*Shakespeare*, 1902, pp. 213-215). The fair friend becomes Sh.'s rival for a woman's affections in 41, and in 42 has married her. In 80 "the rival is described as a poetical contemporary, who has better succeeded in panegyricizing the lady"—"a common lady friend at a distance from London, yet at one accessible on horse-

back." Such a rival in love and poetry Hazlitt finds in BARTHOLOMEW GRIFFIN, a Warwickshire poet described by YEATMAN (*Gentle Sh.*, 1896, pp. 9, 272) as a cousin of Sh.'s. Griffin's *Fidessa*, 1596, which allegedly borrowed passages from *Venus*, was dedicated to William Essex, of Lambourn, Berkshire. Probably *Fidessa* was a real woman whom Sh. met at Lambourn or elsewhere, and perhaps Griffin, more successful in love making, married her. All of which makes up outlandish reasons for an outlandish decision, which almost nobody has taken seriously. The one known point of contact between Sh. and Griffin was the inclusion of poems by each in the *P. P.*, a piratical volume.

After reading hundreds of pages that with absolute confidence make varying identifications of the rival, it is a genuine relief to come across WOLFF (*E. S.*, 1916, XLIX, 180 f.)¹ and to learn that the motif of a rival poet is traditional among the Petrarchans. Wolff shows that Italian sonneteers, like Tasso and Molza, customarily debased themselves to flatter some contemporary poet, and that the rival thus conventionally praised almost invariably replied with eulogistic verses. Unluckily no such eulogies of Sh. can be found. But after pondering over all the men who have been proposed for the rival, one is tempted to emulate PEARSON (*Elizabethan Love Conventions*, 1933, pp. 270 f.) in rejecting all real poets and in following Wolff unreservedly.²

Much more sensational, if quite illogical, is the hypothesis advanced by ORD in *Chaucer & the Rival Poet*, 1921.³ Sh., he observed, borrowed lavishly from CHAUCER in certain plays and in *Venus* and *Lucrece*, while in the sonnets his Chaucerian source was the *Romaunt of the Rose*. Both the last two works (p. 9) "deal with the topics of love and friendship in a philosophical way; moreover they both put emphasis in clear language on the same moral lesson, namely the evil effects of a wrong kind of love and friendship, and the ennobling effect of these passions when rightly employed." Their "verbal and topical similarities are . . . remarkable." Sh. knew Thomas Speght's Chaucer of 1602 (pp. 42, 45-47), and he must "have been somewhat irritated by the conceit shown in . . . the introduction" and in the commendatory poems that were written "presumably by Speght" himself. To Chaucer allusions are made in 38 ("the tenth Muse"), 59, 77, 79, and elsewhere. In particular, mention in 59 of "fue hundreth courses of the Sunne" and "some antique booke" enforce the point (pp. 39 f.): "Five hundred courses . . . [are] 250 years, and going back from 1604, would roughly bring us to the time of Chaucer. The antique book containing the image of Love is surely the *Roman de la Rose*." Sh.'s references, then (p. 51), to "a man who has inspired him" are to Chaucer, but "where he speaks bitterly and ironically—as was his wont at times—he is referring to Speght, whose conceited verse had aroused" his displeasure. Proof of this latter proposition is to be seen (p. 48) in uses of the word *spite* (spelled *spight*), as in 40.14.

Passing over such heretics as MARSCHALL, who in 1926 (see p. 50, above)

¹ In *Sh.'s Sonette*, 1903, pp. xiii f., he had said that 76-86 may refer to an actual competitor.

² For SCOTT's objections to Wolff see pp. 127 f., above.

³ Much of his material had already been presented in *London Shown by Sh.*, 1916, pp. 42-56.

referred to the rival as an unknown "G," and GILBERT SLATER (in *Seven Sh.s.*, 1931, pp. 272 f., he calls RALEIGH the rival), it is pleasant to mention a few of the Shakespearean students who have steadfastly refused to hunt down the rival to his sonnet lair. Three eminent authorities, DOWDEN (ed. 1881), BEECHING (ed. 1904), and ALDEN (ed. 1916), have already been quoted. Long before their day STAUNTON (ed. 1860, p. 772) had curtly announced that "not a particle of evidence has yet been discovered to individualize the allusion" in 80. "It is entirely unknown," PALGRAVE (ed. 1865, p. 246) agreed, "to what contemporary poet" Sh. refers. WHITE (ed. 1883, p. 877) asserted that the rival "remains a part of the mystery of these sonnets." Obsessed as he was by the Sh.-William Hughes love affair, BUTLER hardly ran true to type, but his words (ed. 1899, p. 221) are worth pondering: "I shall not attempt to discover who the poet . . . is; it is quite likely that he was some one whose very name has been lost to us." Unhappily, he spoiled the effect by adding that "of known poets Thomas Watson was the best then writing"¹ in England—*then* meaning about 1586, the impossible date he assigns the sonnets in question. A number of scholars would willingly uphold the decision of ADAMS (*Life*, 1923, p. 177): "That the Rival Poet was a real person seems obvious. . . . Many details, circumstantial and personal, yet obscure, are without the slightest artistic merit, and wholly without significance unless understood as allusions to a specific individual. . . . If we knew whom Shakespeare had in mind, . . . [86] might be effective; as matters stand, however, it is quite meaningless."

In 1911 MACKAIL (*Lectures*, pp. 188 f.) had designated Barnes, Chapman, Daniel, Drayton, Jonson, and Marston as impossible candidates, and had concluded that Sh.'s references are probably "to a poet to whose identity all clue is lost, though it is not impossible that we possess at least one poem [the *L. C.*] written by him." Much Elizabethan poetry that actually "was printed is lost: an immense amount was never printed at all." In the following year MACKAIL (*English Association Essays*, III, 51-70) discussed the *L. C.* in detail, deciding (pp. 68 f.) that "it looks very like as if we had here either the rival poet imitating Shakespeare, or Shakespeare imitating the rival poet. . . . But if we have to choose, it seems easier to believe that a rival poet could catch, here and there, some reflection of Shakespeare's genius, than to believe that Shakespeare would deliberately and with no visible reason write down to the level of a rival's style." The *L. C.*, then, "is a composition by the unknown rival poet of the Sonnets." Unprovable as this theory about the authorship of the *L. C.* is, the remainder of Mackail's words seem to me as reasonable as any yet written on the subject of the rival poet. If the latter was a real, not a fictitious, person, and if Sh.'s comments are sincere, not flattering or ironic, there is no certainty that we have ever heard his name or that, if heard, we have ever thought of associating it with good verse. If the rival composed in praise of his and Sh.'s friend (whoever *he* may have been) only sonnets or other short lyrics, they could have circulated, like Sh.'s, in manuscripts among "his private friends," but, unlike them, could have eluded the greedy hands of a

¹ Hence LARBAUD (Sh.'s *Sonnets*, 1927, pp. xx f.) says that the rival was WATSON, not Chapman.

"procurer" and thus have failed to reach the press. No informed student can deny that "an immense amount" of Elizabethan poetry "was never printed at all"; or, as WYNDHAM (ed. 1898, p. 252) had phrased it, that "masses of material, vital to the issue, which once existed are no longer accessible." Most people are agreed that Sh. did not intend his own sonnets to be printed, and that they were printed without his knowledge and consent. Why should the rival's poems on the "sweet boy" ever have reached the printer's shop? However gratifying it may be to a scholar or critic to identify this man or that as the rival poet, however righteous he may consider his cause, he can hardly expect everybody else to approve of his theorizing unless some biographical document—like a letter or a statement from Sh. or the friend or an acquaintance of theirs—turns up to put the matter out of doubt. After all, such a happy, if improbable, discovery would end only future researches. Those of the past are done; they are safely in the chronicle of wasted time.

APPENDIX XI

WILLOBIE HIS AVISA¹

*Willobie His Avis*a has so often been linked with Sh.'s sonnets that some account of it here is essential. This curious poem was entered at Stationers' Hall on September 3, 1594 (Arber, *Transcript*, 1875, II, 659), and appeared in print with the following title-page:

WILLOBIE / HIS / AVISA. / OR / The true Picture of a mo- / dest Maid,
and of a chaste and / constant wife. / In Hexameter verse. The like argu- / ment
whereof, was neuer hereto / fore published. / Read the preface to the Reader
before / you enter farther. / A vertuous woman is the crowne of her husband,
but / she that maketh him ashamed, is as corruption in / his bones. Prouerb.
12.4. / Imprinted at London by / Iohn Windet. / 1594. / [In compartment,
McKerrow and Ferguson, *Title-page Borders*, 1932, no. 215.]²

4°. *⁴, A-Q⁴, R².

The title-page is followed by two epistles, "To all the constant Ladies & Gentlewomen of England that feare God" (sigs. *2-*2^v) and "To the gentle & courteous Reader" (sigs. *3-A₃), both signed "Hadrian Dorrell." In the second, dated "From my chamber in Oxford this first of October," Hadrian Dorrell explains that he found the poem among the papers of his "very good friend and chamber fellow M. Henry Willobie, a yong man, and a scholler of very good hope," who has departed for foreign lands in the queen's service, leaving with Dorrell "the key of his study, and the vse of all his bookes till his returne." Finding the manuscript of *Willobie His Avis*a, Dorrell was so captivated by it that he has "ventured . . . to publish it without his consent." "Whether it be altogether fayned, or in some part true, or altogether true" he has no way of knowing, but he nevertheless sets forth his speculations. On the one hand, certain evidence points to the conclusion that *Avisa* is "a fained name," composed of the initial letters of the words "Amans vxor inuiolata semper amanda," and Willobie's purpose simply "to set out the Idea of a constant wife" and the characteristics of natives of various countries in love. Yet other considerations lead him "to thinke that there is some thing of trueth hidden vnder this shadow." The first is the following jotting in Willobie's hand: "Yet I would not haue *Auis*a to be thought a politike fiction, nor a truethlesse inuention, for it may be, that I haue at least heard of one in the west of England, in whome the substaunce of all this hath bene verified, and in many thinges the very wordes specified: which hath indured these and many more, and many greater assaultes, yet, as I heare, she standes vnspotted, and vnconquered." The second is

¹ This section was prepared by my friend, MARIE LOUISE EDEL.

² Four extant copies of this edition are listed in *The Carl H. Pforzheimer Library*, 1940, III, 1105. The copy in the British Museum has been reprinted by GROSART (1880), CHARLES HUGHES (1904), and HARRISON (1926). A partial reprint, omitting cantos XXIII-XLIII, is in ACHESON's *Mistress Davenant*, 1913, pp. 203-277. My quotations are from the 1926 reprint.

"the exact descriptions of her [Avisa's] birth, her cuntrye, the place of her abode, and such other circumstances,"¹ and the exactness and detail with which her arguments with her suitors are reported. This evidence makes Dorrell suspect "that though the matter be handled poetically, yet there is some thing vnder these fained names and shoves that hath bene done truely." After all, so constant a woman *is* a possibility; Dorrell himself knows "one. *A.D.* that either hath, or would, if occasion were so offered, indure these, and many greater temptations with a constant mind, and settled heart." He proceeds with a lengthy defense of women against the attacks of ancient and modern writers, and concludes with praise of *Willobie His Avisa*, which he has so christened "because I suppose it was his [Willobie's] doing, being written with his owne hand."

Two commendatory poems follow. The first (sig. A3^v) is signed "Abell

¹ Since these details have a prominent place in many of the modern attempts to establish Avisa's identity, the most striking may profitably be mentioned here. Avisa was born (sig. B2) "At wester side of Albions Ile, Where Austine pitcht his Monkish tent." Her dwelling-place before her marriage is thus described (sigs. B3, B3^v):

Not farre from thence there lyes a vale,
A rosie vale in pleasant plaine;
The Nimphes frequent this happie dale,
Olde Helicon reuiues againe;
Here Muses sing, here Satyres play,
Here mirth resounds both night and day.

At East of this, a Castle stands,
By auncient shepheards built of olde,
And lately was in shepheards hands,
Though now by brothers bought and solde,
At west side springs a Christall well;
There doth this chaste *Avisa* dwell.

And there she dwels in publique eye,
Shut vp from none that list to see. . . .

Along this plaine there lyes a downe,
Where shepheards feed their frisking flocke;
Her Sire the Maier of the towne,
A louely shout of auncient stocke,
Full twentie yeares she liued a maide,
And neuer was by man betrayde.

After her marriage (sig. B4)

 flying fame began to tell,
How beauties wonder was returnd,
From cuntrye hils, in towne to dwell,

in (sig. L4) a

 howse, where hanges the badge
Of Englands Saint, when captaines cry
Victorious land, to conquering rage.

Emet"; to the second (sigs. A4-A4^v), "In praise of Willobie his Avisa, Hexameton to the Author," is appended the cryptic signature "Contraria Contrarijs: Vigilantius: Dormitanus." This "hexameton" has often been mentioned as containing, in the second of its six stanzas, the first direct allusion to Sh. by name:

Though *Collatine* haue deerely bought,
To high renowne, a lasting life,
And found, that most in vaine haue sought,
To haue a *Faire*, and *Constant* wife,
Yet *Tarquyne* pluckt his glistering grape,
And *Shake-speare*, paints poore *Lucrece* rape.

We come at length, after obeying the injunction on the title-page, to the poem itself (sigs. B1-Q3^v). It consists of seventy-two¹ "cantos" composed for the most part² of varying numbers of six-line iambic tetrameter stanzas riming *ababcc*, the same form used in the commendatory "hexameton."³ Taken at face value *Willobie His Avisa* is what Dorrell in his preface to the reader calls "a plaine morrall plot, secretly to insinuate, how honest maides & women in such temptations should stand vpon their guard, considering the glory & praise that commendes a spotlesse life, and the blacke ignominy, & foule contempt that waiteth vpon a wicked and dissolute behauiour." It is the story of the assaults made by a series of wooers upon the constant and chaste Avisa and the manner in which she parries them all. Avisa is endowed at birth by the goddesses with a vexatious combination of "A face, and eye, that should intice" and "A flintie hart, that should indure All fierce assaults, and neuer yeelde." In cantos II-XIII we hear how she resisted, before her marriage, the blandishments of a nobleman. Her marriage at twenty is far from ending her difficulties. She is assailed, we are told in the head-note to canto XIV, "by Ruffians, Roysters, young Gentlemen, and lustie Captaines, which all shee quickly cuts off." Cantos XIV-XXII describe her discomfiture of a certain Caveleiro; cantos XXIII-XXXIII, of "D. B.⁴ A French man"; cantos XXXIV-XLIII, of "Dydimus Harco. Anglo-Germanus." Then comes the portion of the book which has most interested modern commentators. Canto XLIV begins:

Henrico Willobego. Italo-Hispalensis.

H. W. being sodenly infected with the contagion of a fantastick fit, at the first sight of *A*, pyneth a while in secret grieve, at length not able any longer to indure the burning heate of so feruent a humour, bewrayeth the secresy of

¹ Canto LIX is misnumbered LXI, and the error is carried through the succeeding cantos, with the last numbered LXXIV.

² Other stanzaic forms occasionally occur, together with a number of prose passages, head-notes, and inserted mottoes.

³ H. D. GRAY (*Stanford Studies*, 1941, p. 143 n.) points out that most of the cantos consist of six stanzas, and that *hexameton* (for which the "Hexamiter" of the title-page may be a misprint) apparently means "a poem of six stanzas with six lines to the stanza."

⁴ [Expanded in later editions to "Dan. Ben."]

his disease vnto his familiar frend W. S. who not long before had tryed the curtesy of the like passion, and was now newly recouered of the like infection; yet finding his frend let bloud in the same vaine, he took pleasure for a tyme to see him bleed, & in steed of stopping the issue, he inlargeth the wound, with the sharpe rasor of a willing conceit, perswading him that he thought it a matter very easy to be compassed, & no doubt with payne, diligence & some cost in time to be obtayned. Thus this miserable comforter comforting his frend with an impossibilitie, eyther for that he now would secretly laugh at his frends folly, that had giuen occasion not long before vnto others to laugh at his owne, or because he would see whether an other could play his part better then himselfe, & in vewing a far off the course of this louing Comedy, he determined to see whether it would sort to a happier end for this new actor, then it did for the old player. But at length this Comedy was like to haue growen to a Tragedy, by the weake & feeble estate that H. W. was brought vnto, by a desperate vewe of an impossibility of obtaining his purpose, til Time & Necessity, being his best Phisitions brought him a plaster, if not to heale, yet in part to ease his maladye. In all which discourse is liuely represented the vnrewly rage of vnbreded fancy, hauing the raines to roue at liberty, with the dyuers & sundry changes of affections & temptations, which Will, set loose from Reason, can deuise. &c.

In verse H. W. laments his case, breaking off with

But yonder comes my faythfull frend,
That like assaultes hath often tryde,
On his aduise I will depend,
Where I shall winne, or be denyde,
And looke what counsell he shall giue,
That will I do, where dye or liue.

W. S. (canto XLV) observes the changed looks of his "frend Harry," instantly guesses the cause, and asks the lady's name. H. W. (canto XLVI) points out the house where she dwells. W. S. (canto XLVII) says that he knows the "face from whence these flames aryse"; he encourages his friend to hope ("She is no Saynt, She is no Nonne, I thinke in tyme she may be wonne"), and proceeds to give some cynical advice about the best means to a lady's favor. Thus tutored, H. W. returns to the attack, but without success; after a series of rebuffs (cantos XLIX-LXXII), we are told, "H. W. Was now againe stricken so dead, that hee hath not yet any farder assaid, not I thinke euer will, and where he be aliue or dead I know not, and therfore I leaue him." The author ends with praise of Avisa and a hint that he could tell more:

But here I cease for feare of blame,
Although there be a great deale more,
That might be spoken of this dame,
That yet lies hid in secret store,
If this be lik't, then can I say,
Ye may see more another day.¹

¹ The final pages (sigs. Q4-R2) contain two poems, "The resolution of a chast and a constant wife, that minds to continue faithfull vnto her husband.

Many writers believe that there was a second edition in 1596, although no copy of it has been found. In that year appeared a poem called *Penelope's Complaint*,¹ ascribed on the title-page to Peter Colse. In a dedication to Lady Edith Horsey, Colse complains that "an vnknowne Author, hath of late published a pamphlet called *Auisa* (ouerslipping so many praiseworthy matrons) hath registred the meanest"; and in an epistle "To the Reader" he explains the metrical form of his poem: "For that a vaine-glorious *Auisa* (seeking by slaunder of her superiors, to eternize her folly) is in the like verse, (by an vnknown Authour) described: I follow . . . the same stile, & verse, as neither misliking the methode, nor the matter, had it beene applyed to some worthier subiect." Some preliminary Latin verses by S. D. contrast the obscure *Avisa*, "coniux cauponis, filia pandochei," with *Penelope*. To the 1605 edition of *Willobie His Avisa* (see below) are added two items which make reference to the Peter Colse volume. One is a poem, in the stanza-form of *Willobie His Avisa* and *Penelope's Complaint*, entitled "The victorie of English Chastitie, vnder the fained name of *Avisa*" and signed "Thomas Willobie *Frater Henrici Willobie nuper defuncti*." The other, in prose, is "The Apologie, shewing the true meaning of Willoby his *Avisa*," signed by Hadrian Dorrell and dated "Oxford, this 30. of Iune. 1596." "To a newe Edition," he begins, "giue mee leaue, to adde a newe Instruction." Many commentators infer that these two documents were written for a second edition of *Willobie His Avisa* which followed *Penelope's Complaint* in 1596 as quickly as the editor could prepare it for the press.²

To the tune of Fortune," and "The praise of a contented mind." These poems, Dorrell says at the end of the preface to the reader, he "found wrapped altogether with" *Willobie His Avisa*, and he added them "to fill vp some voyd paper." The colophon (sig. R2) reads: "[Device, McKerrow 282] / LONDON / Imprinted by Iohn Windet, dwelling / at Pauls wharfe at the signe of the croffe / Keyes and are there to be folde. / 1594. /"

¹ A reprint of this volume, together with "The victorie of English Chastitie" and Hadrian Dorrell's "Apologie" which appear in later editions of *Willobie His Avisa* (see below), is included in GROSART's 1880 edition, pp. 141-183. Much of the same material is to be found in the reprints of HUGHES (pp. 141-164), ACHESON (pp. 278-299), and HARRISON (pp. 233-253). See also the descriptions of *Penelope's Complaint* by THOMAS PARK (in Sir Eger-ton Brydges, *Restituta*, 1815, III, 529-536) and THOMAS CORSER (*Collectanea Anglo-Poetica*, 1869, II, ii, 421-424), and the reprint of its preliminary matter in W. C. HAZLITT's *Prefaces*, 1874, pp. 161-169. I quote from Grosart.

² It is perhaps worth noting that the 1605 title-page includes these words: "Whereunto is added An Apologie, shewing the true meaning of Willobie his *Auisa*: With the victorie of English Chastitie, neuer before published." These two new items reappear in the 1609 and 1635 editions. In the latter the date-line reads "this 30. of Iune. 1569." Most of the commentators on this matter have been familiar with the 1635, not the 1605, edition; but almost unanimously they have taken 1569 as a misprint for 1596. An exception is HOTSON (*I, William Sh.*, 1937, pp. 69 f.); since he has evidence that Henry Willobie was still alive in 1597, he believes that the "Apologie" and the "Victorie,"

In the "Apologie" Hadrian Dorrell appears indignant at the strictures of Peter Colse and at alleged attempts by readers to identify the characters in *Willobie His Avis* with contemporary personages. Misconstructions of the poem he had hoped "sufficiently preuented in the Preface first printed with this booke. But this is the generall fault of all rash Readers, when they see a booke, they turne either to the middest, or the latter end or at all aduentures reaping [*sic*] that which at first opening they happen on, if that presently do not fit their fancie, they will sodainely pronounce a definitiue sentence of condemnation, both against the matter and the maker." Peter Colse is the worst of such offenders against *Willobie His Avis*. "I dare pawne my life," Dorrell proceeds, with magnificent disregard of his own words in the 1594 preface, "that there is no perticular woman in the world, that was eyther partie or priuie to anye one sentence or word in that booke. This Poeticall fiction was penned by the Author at least for thirty and fve years sithence, (as it will be proued) & lay in wast papers in his studie, . . . and so might haue continued still . . . had not I, contrarie to his knowledge, with paine collected it; and (in consideration of the good ende, to which it was directed, published it. . . . This plaine Morall deuise was plotted onely for the repression and opening of *Vice*, and to the exaltation and triumph of *Vertue*. . . . He fayned therefore an Indiuiduum . . . the more familiarly to expresse it. . . . To this fayned Indiuiduum, he gaue this fained name *Avisa*. . . . The Author was vnknownen not because he [Peter Colse] could not; but because he would not knowe him: his true name being open in euerie Page. . . . It is Chastitie it selfe, not any woman in the world, that is fained to giue these foyles to this foule vice." Dorrell goes on to expound at length the virtuous intention of the poem and to attack those who have attempted to identify Avis and her suitors. "Lastly; concerning the fayned name of AVISA . . . the worde A'visa is compounded . . . of the priuatiue particle *A*, which signifieth *Non*: and of the particle *Visus*, *Visa*, *Visum*, which signifieth, Seene: So that *A'uisa*, should signifie (by this as much as *Non visa*, that is: Such a woman as was neuer seene." The word is also related to the Latin *avis*, a bird, for as a bird mounts upward to heaven, so chastity makes the mind mount from earthly things and seek out God. "If any man therefore by this, should take occasion to surmise, that the Author ment to note any woman, whose name soundes something like that name, it is too childish and too absurd, and not beseeeming any deepe iudgement. . . . I dare precisely aduouch, that the Author intended in this discourse, neyther the description nor prayse of any particular woman, Nor the naming or cyphering of any particular man." The author, we are told in conclusion, is "now of late gone to God." In "The victorie of English Chastitie," which relates how the rival claims of Penelope and Avis are decided in favor of the latter by the judgment of a certain Rogero, Avis is

both of which speak of Willobie as dead, must be referred to 1599: "the error in '1569' must be one not of transposition of 9 and 6, but of inversion of the first 9 of 1599 to read 6." Perhaps he would transfer this hypothesis to the second 9 to explain the 1596 of the 1605 edition. BROOKE (*Essays in Honor of Albert Feuillerat*, 1943, pp. 101 f.) conjectures rather that the reference to Willobie's death was first inserted in the 1605 reprint of the 1596 epistle.

similarly called "not seene bird" and is said to represent "*Chaste vertue in a fained name.*" But again a more specific identity is suggested by the information that she "both by Syre and spouse, Was linckt to men of meanest trade."

An edition in 1599 has been conjectured from an entry in the Stationers' Register (Arber, *Transcript*, 1876, III, 678). To the list of books mentioned as burned in Stationers' Hall on June 4, 1599, is added: "Theis staid / *Caltha Poetarum* / Halls *Satires* / Willobies *Adviso* to be Called in." At all events, the edition of 1605 is described on the title-page as "The fourth time corrected and Augmented." The edition of 1609, a copy of which I have not seen, is said by W. C. HAZLITT (*Hand-Book*, 1867, p. 658) to be called the fourth on the title-page, a circumstance which led GROSART (1880 reprint, p. xxviii) to conjecture that it was "probably only 'remainder' of 1605 edition, with a new title-page, and not a 'fifth' or new edition." On September 11, 1611 (Arber, *Transcript*, 1876, III, 466), John Windet transferred his rights in *Willobie His Avis*a to William Stansby, who brought out a new edition in 1635, described on the title-page as "The fifth time corrected and Augmented."¹

Despite the suspicious features of *Willobie His Avis*a—the blatantly contradictory statements of Dorrell, the suggestive use of initials, the censorship and long-continued popularity of what purports to be a moral treatise—the poem seems to have raised no doubts in the minds of the few writers who mention it before the middle of the nineteenth century. GEORGE ELLIS, for example, who included short excerpts from it in the various editions of his *Specimens of the Early English Poets* (1790, 1801, etc.), added to the third edition of 1803 (II, 375) a biographical note on "Henry Willoby," drawn trustingly from Dorrell's remarks. JOSEPH RITSON (*Bibliographia Poetica*, 1802, pp. 395 f.) and DRAKE (*Sh. and His Times*, 1817, I, 663-666) listed Henry Willobie among Sh.'s contemporaries; and THOMAS PARK (in Sir Egerton Brydges, *Restituta*, 1815, III, 529-536), who mentions *Willobie His Avis*a in an account of *Penelope's Complaint*, did not question the reliability of Dorrell's preface. JOSEPH HASLEWOOD (*British Bibliographer*, 1814, IV, 241-259), who knew the 1605 edition, noted the statement in the "Apologie" (contradicting the 1594 preface) that *Willobie His Avis*a was written "at least for thirty and fve years sithence"; but he was untroubled by the discrepancy. "It is probable," he concluded, "the preface may be relied on. . . . Dorrell's subsequent anachronism may be ascribed to inadvertency; to a zealous but hurried attempt to parry the attack of the critic, by the supposed youth of the writer; and by fixing the composition at a period sufficiently early to prevent an unfavourable comparison with more recent productions."² This interpretation was repeated by PHILIP BLISS (*Athenae Oxonienses*, 1813, I, columns 756-758).

¹ A facsimile of this edition was issued in 1886 by the Spenser Society (no. 42).

² BROOKE (*Essays in Honor of Albert Feuillerat*, 1943, p. 101) would erase the inconsistency, which several commentators have cited as evidence of Dorrell's unreliability, by interpreting "penned . . . at least for thirty and fve years sithence" to mean "based on conditions of a generation earlier."

Apparently the first person to connect W. S. with Sh. was COLLIER (*Sh.'s Comedies, Histories, etc.*, 2d ed., 1858, I, 115 n.): "It may be almost doubted whether W. S. mentioned by Henry Willobie in his poem called 'Avisa' . . . were not intended for the initials of William Shakespeare," for the account of him "employs so many theatrical expressions, that it seems as if the mention of him had led the author to the use of them." Two years later W. C. TREVELYAN (*N. & Q.*, January 28, 1860, pp. 59 f.) went a step farther by suggesting that Mr. W. H. of the Q dedication "may have been his [Sh.'s] friend, this Henry Willobie . . . whose sonnets, written some years probably before Shakespeare's, must have been known to him, and may have begotten—that is, suggested—a similar work to our immortal bard." Indeed, he conjectured that cantos XLV and XLVII, which are represented as the actual words of W. S. and have those initials prefixed, "may not improbably be his [Sh.'s] writing." W. C. HAZLITT (the same, December 2, 1865, p. 449) "set aside without comment" Trevelyan's identification of Mr. W. H.,¹ but it was soon repeated as a possibility by NEIL (*Athenaeum*, April 27, 1867, p. 552).

INGLEBY, editing *Sh.'s Centurie of Prayse* in 1874, supported (p. 74) the identification of W. S. with Sh. on two grounds: "(1) Because W. S. appears in this 'imaginary conversation' as a standard authority on Love; and assuredly Shakespeare was *the* amatory poet of the day, and, to judge by his Sonnets, 'had tried the curtesy of the like passion,' and had come unscathed out of the ordeal; (2) Because it is said that this W. S. 'in vewing the course of this loving Comedy determined to see whether it would sort to a happier end *for this new actor, then it did for the old player*,' with other theatrical imagery specially applicable to a player and dramatist. Assuredly, no other contemporary poet of the same initials, whether lyrist or dramatist (and five or six might be named), had any claim to this distinction."² Perhaps the use of initials made Ingleby suspect that there was more in the poem than met the eye; at all events, when he edited the *Sh. Allusion-Books. Part I* in the same year he expressed (pp. xxviii–xxx) grave doubts about the good faith of Dorrell's account of Willobie and of himself.

In 1880 GROSART published the first critical edition of *Willobie His Avisa*.³

¹ Hazlitt's literal acceptance of Dorrell's preface is reflected in his *Prefaces*, 1874, p. 151.

² Reediting this volume in 1879, LUCY TOULMIN SMITH added (p. 11) a third argument which was to be developed by later writers: "Compare also his [Sh.'s] counsel to the wooer in . . . [*P. P.*, XVIII, "When as thine eye hath chose the Dame"], to which Willobie's verses bear a strong and curious resemblance in metre, subject, and treatment." On the authorship of the *P. P.* poem see *Sh.'s Poems*, 1938, pp. 553 f.

³ SWINBURNE (*Study of Sh.*, 1879, pp. 62 f.) had hailed enthusiastically Grosart's plan to edit "the one contemporary book which has ever been supposed to throw any direct or indirect light on the mystic matter" of the sonnets. He spoke of its reissue as "the one inestimable boon long hoped for against hoping, and as yet but 'a vision in a dream' to the most learned and most loving of true Shakespearean students." It is interesting to note that HUGHES's 1904 reprint is dedicated to Swinburne.

He believed (pp. xviii-xxiii) that Henry Willobie or Willoughby was a real person—the second son of Henry Willoughby of Wiltshire, who matriculated at St. John's College, Oxford, in 1591, at the age of sixteen¹—but not the author of *Willobie His Avis*. The actual author was the man who wrote under the pseudonym Hadrian Dorrell and who followed the common practise of Elizabethan authors of transferring “the names of patrons and friends to their productions.” Under the initials W. S. “Dorrell” certainly refers to his friend Sh. To the arguments of Ingleby and Smith, Grosart added others (pp. xv-xvii): the “familiar allusion to Shakespeare in the commendatory ‘Hexameton’ so self-evidently by one who was of a group of friends known to, and by, him”; “the pleasant girds at W. S.’s love-experiences . . . chronologically congruent with Shakespeare’s sonnets, and congruent with friendship”; “the correspondence between the ‘counsel’ given by W. S. . . . and Shakespeare’s own sonnets.” Grosart could not accept Trevelyan’s ascription of the W. S. sections to Sh. himself, but he was “disposed to regard them as versifying actual *badinage* and ‘counsel’ given by Shakespeare to their author . . . the one definite ray of light shot across the love-experiences made immortal in the sonnets, by a contemporary.”² Grosart did not suggest that *Avisa* was the dark woman, although (p. xxvi) “it can scarcely be doubted that *Avisa* had a flesh-and-blood original,” and he rejected (pp. xvii f.) Trevelyan’s conjecture that Henry Willobie was the W. H. of the dedication, since he “was certainly dead by 1596 at latest”; but he believed (p. xxx) that “the H. W. and W. S. verse-dialogues . . . have not yet yielded up all their meaning to Shakespeareans or students of the sonnets of Shakespeare.”

DOWDEN (ed. 1881, pp. 42 f.) was unable to see any parallelism between *Willobie His Avis* and the sonnets. “Assuming that W. S. is William Shakspeare,” he declared, “we learn that he had loved and recovered from the infection of his passion before the end of 1594. The chaste *Avisa* is as unlike as possible the dark woman of the Sonnets; nor does anything appear which can connect Henry Willobie with Shakspeare’s young friend of the Sonnets, except the fact that the initials of the only begetter’s name were W. H., those of Henry Willobie reversed, and that Henry Willobie assails the chastity of a married woman. He is, however, repulsed by the chaste *Avisa*. Except in the reference to W. S.’s love, and his recovery from passion, I see no possible point of connection between *Willobie’s Avis* and Shakspeare’s Sonnets.” His words had no restraining effect upon FLEAY, who five years later (*Chronicle History*, 1886, pp. 121-125; see also his *Biographical Chronicle*, 1891, II, 221-223) announced: “That it [*Willobie His Avis*] is the same story as that of the Sonnets, that H. W. is Henry Wriothsley, and that the black woman of the Sonnets is identical with *Avisa*, I regard as indubitable.” Willobie and Dorrell are fictitious; the author-editor hoax and the fact that in 1599 the book was called in mark it as “libellous, calumnious, personally abusive.” Believing

¹ See JOSEPH FOSTER, *Alumni Oxonienses . . . 1570-1714*, 1892, IV, 1651.

² Grosart conjectured (p. xvii) that Sh. may have sent his poem “When as thine eye” (*P. P.*, XVIII) to “his friend H. W., or Dorrell.” In a note he adds that the dialog between W. S. and H. W. in *Willobie His Avis* “seems to verify the Shakespearean authorship” of the *P. P.* poem.

that the dark woman can be identified by means of the descriptive details about Avis, Fleay tracked down her residence in "the vale of Evesham, the castle being that of Bengworth and the well that of Abberton," and inferred that her parents were keepers of a St. George Inn.

The interpretation of PLUMPTRE (*Contemporary Review*, 1889, LV, 590-595) pieced together the suggestions of his predecessors. He found a "singular correspondence" between the story of 41, 42, 127-154 and that of *Willobie His Avis* which makes the identification of H. W., "whether Willobie was his true name or not," with the friend of the sonnets "*primâ facie* a tenable hypothesis." The perplexing "Apologie" and the action taken against *Willobie His Avis* in 1599 are evidence that "the poem sketched the outlines of a real story, in which persons of importance were involved, that either the Willoughby family, who did not like their name to be connected with it, or Lord Southampton and his friends, threatened action which might have had unpleasant consequences." Taking a hint from Ingleby, Plumptre placed Avis in Glastonbury, where he found evidence of a St. George Inn in Sh.'s time. He admitted some difficulty in the fact that Avis is a pattern of constancy while the dark woman is unchaste, but he explained that the sonnets belong "to a time of overwrought emotion and brain-tension," when Sh. "might well exaggerate the nature of his own affection, and the extent to which it had been returned, might well distort also what had passed between his friend and her whom they both admired." This difficulty is not "strong enough to counterbalance the conclusion . . . [that *Willobie His Avis*] is more or less closely connected with the problem of the Sonnets, and was written by one who moved on the outskirts of the society into which Shakespeare . . . had by that time risen." GOLLANCZ (ed. 1896, pp. xxi f.) made the more plausible suggestion that the discrepancy resulted from the "satirical and perhaps libellous nature" of *Willobie His Avis*; he even suspected that the reference to *Lucrece* in the commendatory verses is "ironical." "'H. W.' and 'W. S.,' suggestive of Henry Wriothsesley and William Shakespeare," he admitted, "may of course be purely accidental, but the coincidence is remarkable." CHAMBERS (*Academy*, 1897, LII, 98) is less cautious; he feels sure of a relationship between *Willobie His Avis* and the sonnets, although its nature is "at present an unsolved mystery." STOPES (*Athenaeum*, March 26, 1898, p. 405) and LEE (*Life*, 1898, pp. 155-158) both admit that W. S. may not be Sh. but repeat the familiar reasons that make the identification likely. Stopes attempts to reconcile the two stories by suggesting that perhaps by 1594 Sh.'s "dark-eyed temptress had . . . already cured him by preferring his friend.¹ The young earl [Southampton] was also soon able to throw her trammels off, because in September, 1595, we hear that he was paying too marked attention to the fair Elizabeth Vernon." Lee conjectures that *Willobie His Avis* may be "a half-jesting reference . . . by a literary comrade" to Sh.'s love-affair. In accord with his well-known attempts to minimize the element of genuine emo-

¹ [Similarly WILDE about 1890 (*Portrait of Mr W. H.*, 1921, pp. 102-104) inferred from *Willobie His Avis* that Sh.'s "love for the dark lady must have passed away before 1594," in which year he "had already been acquainted for at least three years with Willie Hughes."]

tion in the sonnets, he concludes: "If . . . it was Shakespeare who took a roguish delight in watching his friend Willobie suffer . . . it is clear that the theft of Shakespeare's mistress by another friend did not cause him deep or lasting distress. The allusions that were presumably made to the episode by the author of 'Avisa' bring it, in fact, nearer the confines of comedy than of tragedy."¹

Meanwhile the skeptics were not silent. "The theory which identifies him [Sh.] with the W. S. of Willobie's 'Avisa,'" said J. C. COLLINS (*Saturday Review*, 1898, LXXXV, 285; *Ephemera Critica*, 1901, p. 225), "has no real basis to rest on, and without corroboration is absolutely inadmissible as evidence." HERFORD (ed. 1899, p. 372) echoed him. The theatrical imagery in canto XLIV had been the first and most frequently cited argument for the identification; it was dealt a severe blow by BEECHING (ed. 1904, p. xxvii n.), who quite rightly pointed out that, if W. S. is called "the old player," "the love affair had been previously spoken of as 'a comedy like to end in a tragedy,' and Willobie himself is called the 'new actor.' There is, therefore, not the slightest reason for taking the one expression more literally than the other."² And where, it may be asked, is there anything in the sonnets that could be referred to as a recovery from love? The strongest statement that GODWIN (ed. 1900, p. 164) allowed himself is: "We have, perhaps, a gleam of historical evidence as to a real experience lying back of these sonnets" in *Willobie His Avisa*. "The whole volume," asserted LUCE (*Handbook*, 1906, p. 92), "appears to be fictitious, and even if W. S. here stands for William Shakespeare, we grasp no solid fact." W. C. HAZLITT (*Shakespeare*, 1908, p. 185) refused even to admit that W. S. represents Sh., preferring "to credit William Smith."

Less conservative interpretations were given fresh impetus by ACHESON'S *Sh. and the Rival Poet*, 1903. Later volumes (see below) were to spin out Acheson's theories to enormous lengths; here he makes only a tentative study of *Willobie His Avisa*. After identifying Southampton as the friend and Chapman as the rival poet of the sonnets, he declares himself (pp. 208-210) "strongly of the opinion" that *Willobie His Avisa* "refers to Shakespeare and Southamp-

¹ LEE made similar comments in his article on Henry Willoughby in the *D. N. B.*, 1900, 1909, where he expressed his belief that the author was a friend of Willoughby who adopted the pseudonym Hadrian Dorrell. His ideas are perhaps reflected in the conclusions of H. J. BRIDGES (*Our Fellow Sh.*, 1916, pp. 277 f.), who observes that *Willobie His Avisa* "has none of the tragedy suggested by the sonnets addressed to the Dark Lady," and warns his readers against taking the sonnets too literally. Diametrically opposed is BRANDL's decision (*Sh.'s Sonette*, 1913, pp. xxxviii-xlvi) that *Willobie His Avisa* is valuable as an independent source of information which supports a personal interpretation of the sonnets.

² [This interpretation of the imagery, first suggested by DOWDEN (ed. 1881, p. 42 n.), has often been repeated, as by RICHARD GARNETT and EDMUND GOSSE (*English Literature*, 1904, II, ii, 198 n.) and L. L. SCHÜCKING (*Die Geisteswissenschaften*, April 16, 1914, p. 791). MAURICE JONAS (*Sh. and the Stage*, 1918, pp. 188 f.), however, in search of evidence for Sh.'s acting career, asserted unhesitatingly that "W. S. plainly indicates William Shakespeare," and took literally the term "old player."]

ton, and to their acquaintance with the 'dark lady' of the Sonnets, who is here given the name of 'Avisa.'" Like earlier writers he notes the contrast between Avisa's virtue and the dark woman's lack of it, but he has a new explanation: "I do not agree . . . that this poem [*Willobie His Avisa*] refers to the period of the affair with the 'dark lady' revealed in the Sonnets, but am inclined to believe that it alludes to an earlier period of Shakespeare's acquaintance with this woman, which antedates this affair by nearly two years." Confirmation of this notion he finds in the fact that the poem, "upon its first publication in 1594, was allowed to pass unchallenged; in 1596, however (in which year I date Southampton's infidelity to Shakespeare . . .), upon its second issue, it was immediately condemned by the public censor as libelous. This action of the censor shows that the object of the libel at this date felt the stroke and complained." In this volume Acheson ventures no guess as to Avisa's identity; but he infers, like others before him, that she kept an inn, the George or the St. George and Dragon.

STOPES (ed. 1904, pp. xxxiv f.), who found *Willobie His Avisa* "a strange reminiscence" of the love story in the sonnets, attempted to explain the favorable picture of its heroine by suggesting that "the 'dark lady' herself may have been the moving spirit in the publication. Personalities were evidently intended and resented, pressure was applied, and the work was called in. But it doubtless left its pain in Shakespeare's heart." A much more revolutionary idea was proposed in the same year by CREIGHTON (*Sh.'s Story*, pp. 182-204), who was "morally certain" that Southampton, Sh.'s friend of the sonnets, was the author¹ of *Willobie His Avisa*. The poem is "a skit upon Shakespeare's tragic piece" *Lucrece*, which is mentioned in the commendatory verses "to connect the one poem with the other." In the prose portion of canto XLIV Southampton "relates the inception, progress, and conclusion of his task under the medical allegory of an attack of the infection or plague." Clearly, Sh.'s "advice is sought and given as the writer of love-poems by which H. W. had been 'infected' "—that is, of *Venus* and *Lucrece*; and "banter" is directed at "the addiction of a sober and thoughtful man to Ovidian subjects." "The meaning of this humorous parable is, that Southampton began the poem on his own initiative, and that Shakespeare, when told of it, encouraged him in it, and gave him some advice, but left him for the most part to his own resources." But Southampton's "humour is all the better if it be not taken as wholly allegorical," and Creighton made some attempt to find Avisa's original among the barmaids and innkeepers of Southampton's county of Hampshire. He turned up as possible candidates an Avis Yate of Basingstoke and an Ann Bird of Winchester; but he did not press the identification of Avisa.

CHARLES HUGHES, editing *Willobie His Avisa* in 1904, reverted (pp. ix-xxvii)

¹ Creighton believed that Sh. wrote some of the early cantos (perhaps III, VI, XI-XIII) and probably cooperated in the sections dealing with the French and German suitors, who burlesque Barnabe Barnes and Gabriel Harvey. There is no evidence for Sh.'s authorship of cantos XLV and XLVII, "but there is a poem of his . . . [*P. P.*, XVIII] which is upon the same theme (as well as in the same stanza and metre)."

to a much more literal acceptance of Dorrell's preface. Henry Willobie or Willoughby was the son of Henry Willoughby, Esquire, of Knoyll Odyern (now West Knoyle), Wiltshire. He entered St. John's College, Oxford, in 1591; on the same day Thomas Darell of Berkshire entered Brasenose.¹ In his poem Willobie describes his passion for a local belle. Hughes believes that the topographical details of the poem point to Mere and Cerne Abbas, in the vicinity of West Knoyle; and he selects for the original of Avis a certain Avice or Avys Forward, whose birth in 1575 is recorded in the Mere register. She "might have served in the inn at Cerne Abbas before her marriage, and kept the inn at Mere after her marriage, or vice-versa." But how does Sh. come into the picture? Hughes is convinced that in 1593 he was with Southampton in nearby Shaftesbury, where the earl's sister and brother-in-law were probably living in that year. "Young Henry Willobie, poet and lover, would seek out the author of *Venus and Adonis*, and the youth of nineteen would feel the greatness of the master-poet of twenty-nine. He would tell him of his passion for Avis. . . . The poet would read aloud to his two young admirers passages from the *Rape of Lucrece*, on which he was at work." Thus Sh. found a place in Willobie's love poem before (as Hughes thinks possible) its young author went off to die in Hungary on a crusade against the Turks, leaving his papers in Dorrell's hands. Hughes, it will be observed, makes no connection between *Willobie His Avis* and the sonnets.

Meanwhile ACHESON had been pursuing his investigation of the puzzle, and in 1913 he made known his results in *Mistress Davenant the Dark Lady of Sh.'s Sonnets*. He had convinced himself that the author of *Willobie His Avis* was the poet Matthew Roydon; since Roydon was on terms of close friendship with Chapman, Acheson's candidate for the rival poet, *Willobie His Avis* must be a libelous attack on Sh., one of several attempts to disrupt his friendship with his patron Southampton. In 1596 Roydon wrote *Penelope's Complaint* (under the new pseudonym of Peter Colse) and the "Apologie" to make more pointed the satire of the proposed new edition; with similar intention he and Chapman engineered the publication of the 1599 *P. P.* with its revealing inclusion of sonnets 138 and 144 and the poem "When as thine eye."² The fact that *Willobie His Avis* is dated from Oxford caused Acheson to seek Avis's original in a tavern there, and he was led straight to the gossip of Aubrey and Oldys about John Davenant's wife (see p. 269, above). But again, as in 1903, Acheson insisted that the 1594 *Willobie His Avis* refers to an earlier, the sonnets to a later, stage in the relationship of Sh., Southampton, and the dark woman.

¹ This Darell (or Dorrell) Hughes conjecturally identifies as the son of a rector of Welford. As editor of *Willobie His Avis* he may have called himself Hadrian with reference to Adriano de Armado. He may be the D. B. (Dorrell of Berkshire or Dorrell of Brasenose) of cantos XXIII-XXXIII.

² Acheson considers this poem the work of Roydon. Because of the relationship between the *P. P.*, *Willobie His Avis*, and the triangle reflected in the sonnets, Acheson asserts (p. 126), Sh. protested about the 1599 *P. P.* On this matter see Sh.'s *Poems*, 1938, pp. 533-538, and ROLLINS's edition of the 1612 *P. P.*, 1940, pp. xxiv-xxxii.

W. BANG (Académie Royale de Belgique, *Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres*, 1913, pp. 116 f.) immediately found support for Acheson's ascription of the authorship of *Willobie His Avis* by discovering in "Hadrian Dorrell" an anagram of "Harral(l)d Roiden." The mystifying "Harral(l)d" he elucidated in turn by striking off the endings of "Vigilantius Dormitanus" and rearranging "Vigilant Dormitan" into "Vigilant Mt. Roidan"; "the *vigilant* . . . gives us the key for the *herald*." ACHESON, spurred to emulation (*A Woman Coloured Ill*, 1913), looked for more anagrams in the "hexameton" and discovered that the first thirteen letters of the first line, "In Lavine land though Livy boast," could be rearranged to produce "Ill In [= Jn = Jane] Davenant." Thus the commendatory poem contains the names of Sh. and Mrs. Davenant and is signed by Roydon.

The flaws in Acheson's arguments were pointed out in reviews by FÖRSTER (*Jahrbuch*, 1914, L, 201-205), TANNENBAUM (*Dial*, 1914, LVI, 494-497), and ALDEN (*J. E. G. P.*, 1915, XIV, 449-460). ALDEN, surveying (ed. 1916, pp. 478-482) the literature of the subject up to his date, stigmatized as "wholly destitute of proof" not only Acheson's theory but "the entire hypothesis that *Willobie His Avis* forms a commentary on the Sonnets. In the first place, no real reason has appeared for connecting the name of Sh. with the W. S. of the poem"; and even if that connection were proved, "there would still be no reason for viewing the poem as a commentary on the Sonnets." Such a theory "would imply an earlier date for the Sonnets than most critics find credible"; besides, there is no evidence of recovery from love in the sonnets, nor "is it safe to assume that Sh. was never in love but once." Alden rightly pointed out that there is no evidence in *Willobie His Avis* that W. S. had been in love with Avis.¹ As to the satirical intention of the poem, "there is evidence . . . [that it] was understood to involve personal allusions, and to be suspected on that account. But to admit this is quite a different matter from the supposition that the whole story is to be read as that of an *unchaste* lady. If it is, the point is very difficult to discover. . . . If this be a burlesque, or satire, of the story which has generally been read in connection with the triangle of characters in the Sonnets, the difficult irony of a Defoe or a Swift pales into insignificance beside the ambiguity which its author attained."

Entirely unchastened, ACHESON repeated the outlines of his interpretation in *Sh.'s Lost Years in London*, 1920, and shortly afterward (*New York Times Book Review*, March 20, 1921, pp. 4, 27; *Sh.'s Sonnet Story*, 1922) announced the most sensational of all his "discoveries"; namely, that Avis is to be equated not with Mrs. Jane Davenant, known to history as John Davenant's only wife, but with her alleged predecessor Anne Sachfield Davenant, the illegitimate daughter of William Bird, one-time mayor of Bristol (see p. 270, above). Acheson remained faithful to his belief that *Willobie His Avis* refers to a phase in the relationship of the sonnet personages earlier than the triangle reflected in the sonnets themselves; but he expanded somewhat his earlier reconstruction of the genesis of *Willobie His Avis*. Roydon's composition of the poem (p. 164) "was not originally inspired by the Southamp-

¹ This same point was later made by CHAMBERS (*William Sh.*, 1930, I, 569) and others.

ton-Shakespeare-Dark Lady episode, but . . . he had already written, or was at work upon, a poem dealing with his favourite subject of chastity, and, strange as it may seem, probably celebrating the same original for Avisá, but with no satirical or defamatory reflection against her at that time, when he and his friend Chapman . . . became aware of the conditions in Southampton's affairs, and . . . he then introduced the late cantos of the poem which deal with this phase of the story, added some indicative verses to the first canto and a few lines through the poem, and also prefixed his more pointed verses, mentioning Shakespeare and ciphering Davenant,¹ as well as his 'Address to the Reader.'² The later developments in the relations of Sh., Southampton, and Anne Davenant are hinted at in the publication of the 1596 edition with (p. 173) "its scandalously revelatory appendages" and of *Penelope's Complaint*.

Acheson's work won very few adherents (see pp. 270 f., above), although an occasional commentator approved one detail or another of his theory. For example, POEL³ (*T. L. S.*, June 2, 1921, p. 356) and LEE (*Year's Work*, 1923, p. 74) lauded his discovery of a first wife for John Davenant but were unconvinced of her identity with Avisá and the dark woman. ROBERTSON (*Problems*, 1926, pp. 76-78) found Acheson's ascription of *Willobie His Avisá* to Roydon the most tenable part of the whole theory. ADAMS (*Life*, 1923, pp. 159 f.), however, had earlier objected vigorously to "foisting this amateurish production on the famous poet Mathew Royden." In his opinion, *Willobie His Avisá*, like Thomas Middleton's *Ghost of Lucrece*, is "by imitation a compliment to the popularity of" *Lucrece*. Its author was Henry Willoughby "an Oxford student referred to in [William Covell's] *Polimanteia* (1595)⁴ as

¹ ["Ill In Davenant" now, of course, refers to John, not Jane.]

² A somewhat similar process of composition has recently been suggested by H. D. GRAY (*Stanford Studies*, 1941, pp. 143-151), who is by no means a follower of Acheson. The author (who is, according to Gray, a poet far inferior to Roydon), finding it difficult to dispose of his dull moral treatise to a bookseller, added the W. S. episode, with its references to a public scandal over which London was agog in 1594, to increase the popular appeal of the poem. Since the gossipers did not know the truth, the story of *Willobie His Avisá* naturally differs from that of the sonnets. Gray's theory is based on DARBY's early dating of some of the sonnets (see p. 62, above).

³ Poel had a theory of his own about the relation of *Willobie His Avisá* to the sonnets. To the libel, "it may be presumed, Shakespeare replied by writing the sonnets about the 'dark lady.' Few if any could have been written to the lady herself, or ever have been read by her. They were intended for Southampton and his friends. The poet points out that the lady had more than one lover; and that as for himself he does not defend his faults, and he would rather be what he knows he is, a sinner, than be one of those who, being sinners themselves, delight in spying out the misdoings of others!" In *Prominent Points*, 1919 (table I), however, he calls the supposed reference to Sh. as W. S. "unproved."

⁴ [As several writers have pointed out, this reference need signify nothing more than Covell's acquaintance with the 1594 *Willobie His Avisá*.]

one of the Oxford men 'able to sing sweetly,'" who followed a popular Elizabethan precedent in pretending that another was responsible for the publication of his work.

STOPES (*Life of . . . Southampton*, 1922, pp. 67 f.) makes non-committal reference to the problem of *Willobie His Avis*, admitting that in spite of the arguments advanced to prove the identity of H. W. and W. S. with Southampton and Sh. "H. W. might really have meant Henry Willoughby, and W. S. might have represented William Stanley before he became the Earl of Derby, or any other man in the country" with those initials. With similar moderation MATHEW (*Image of Sh.*, 1922, p. 106) says only that "the theme [of *Willobie His Avis*] may have been a parody of the tale in the *Sonnets*"; this would explain why it was reprinted in 1609. HERFORD (*Sketch*, 1923, p. 57) believes there is a "fair chance" that W. S. represents Sh. and that, consequently, "the intrigue [of the sonnets], however 'conventional,' was not wholly unreal." But no such uncertainty afflicts C. R. HAINES (*Quarterly*, 1921, CCXXXVI, 243), who assures his readers that "beyond question he [Sh.] was a man of strong passions and a recognised master in the art of love, as is proved by the curious poem, 'Willobie his Avis.'"

To his reprint of *Willobie His Avis* in 1926 HARRISON appended (pp. 181-231) an essay dealing at considerable length with the problems raised by the poem. There is "no reason," he sensibly points out (p. 194), "to identify Avis with the Dark Lady of the Sonnets, for they have nothing in common. The one fact that is known about the Dark Lady is that she was dark; there is no suggestion of darkness about Avis. The main facts that are known about Avis are that she was the wife of an innkeeper and the daughter of an innkeeper; there is no suggestion that the Dark Lady served in an inn." Like Hughes, he places the poem in the vicinity of Cerne Abbas in Dorsetshire; there Avis was born, and after her marriage she lived in Sherborne, eleven miles to the north. But he rejects Hughes's theory of Henry Willobie's authorship and is inclined to believe with Acheson that Roydon was the author. The most famous resident of Sherborne in 1593 and 1594 was Sir Walter Raleigh, the head of the unorthodox group to which Roydon, like Chapman, belonged. Harrison believes that *Willobie His Avis* was one shot fired in a literary warfare between Raleigh's School of Night¹ and the rival Essex-Southampton-Sh. faction. The clue to the nature of the attack Harrison finds (pp. 229-231) in the mention of *Lucrece* in the preliminary verses. "It is evident that 'Vigilantius: Dormitanus' intends *Willobie His Avis* to be coupled in the reader's mind with Shakespeare's *Lucrece*. We have seen how often a secondary intention is to be found in the poems of the 1590's. The most important poem produced by the followers of Southampton in 1594 was *The Rape of Lucrece*. Shakespeare in all probability had no intention of mak-

¹ On the alleged existence and activities of the School of Night see, in addition to Acheson's books, QUILLER-ROUCH and J. D. WILSON's edition of *Love's Labor's Lost*, 1923, pp. xxviii-xxxiv; HARRISON, *An Elizabethan Journal . . . 1591-1594*, 1928, pp. 398-400; M. C. BRADBROOK, *The School of Night*, 1936; FRANCES A. YATES, *A Study of Love's Labour's Lost*, 1936. Some objections are raised by E. A. STRATHMANN in *M. L. N.*, 1941, LVI, 176-186.

ing his Tarquin a portrait of any living person; but his readers, incurable in their search for hidden meanings, saw in this poem, written for the Essex-Southampton group, a very considerable likeness between Tarquin the Ravisher and their enemy, Raleigh the Proud. . . . And so, in the summer of 1594, the followers of Sir Walter Raleigh, who were living with him at Sherborne, stung beyond endurance by these incessant attacks on their patron, composed this poem of *Willobie His Avis*a, seeking to hold his enemies up to ridicule, not in any fable culled from Antiquity, but with the plain tale of the country hostess who so triumphantly humiliated her noble wooers. *Willobie His Avis*a is the sequel to Shakespeare's *Lucrece*."

CHAMBERS, reviewing Harrison's book (*Year's Work*, 1928, p. 130), objected that, although he "makes out a good case for Sherborne as one of the localities of the poem, . . . he does not show that Southampton was concerned in the movement against Raleigh, and he does not explain away the evidence for a real Henry Willobie." Again in 1930 (*William Sh.*, I, 570 f.) he demurred at Harrison's rejection of Willobie's authorship (especially since he had located the poem close to the seat of the Willoughby family in West Knoyle) and at his ascription of the poem to Roydon, whose known poetry is "more pedantic and cumbrous in style" than *Willobie His Avis*a. Although he conceded "some element of scandal" to the poem, he regarded it as "probably . . . beyond recovery." But M. C. BRADBROOK (*School of Night*, 1936, p. 24) agrees with Harrison that *Willobie His Avis*a is a product of the School of Night¹ "mocking Essex and Southampton and the latest product of their poet, *The Rape of Lucrece*." ALDEN BROOKS (*Will. Sh. Factotum*, 1937, pp. 238-266), too, calls it the "riposte" of Roydon, on behalf of the School of Night, to *Lucrece*, which, however, he regards as "a devised attack on Raleigh." But Brooks, unlike Harrison, makes a connection between *Willobie His Avis*a and the sonnets by adopting Acheson's Anne Davenant theory.

L. B. WRIGHT (*Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England*, 1935, pp. 476-478) introduces some interesting suggestions about *Willobie His Avis*a into a discussion of the popularity of Elizabethan books about women. "Whatever may have been the allegorical significance of . . . [*Willobie His Avis*a], the reason for the continued popularity which gave it a fifth edition in 1635 was the fulsome praise of the honest innkeeping maid. . . . The poem may be an allegorical attack on the Earl of Southampton by Raleigh's faction . . . , but outwardly it is a plain poem in praise of middle-class woman and bourgeois virtue, and it was doubtless interpreted as such by most of its readers. That it made odious comparisons with the nobility may account for its having been called in.² . . . Its own ridicule of the morals of men is obvious, and, if the 'H. W.' of the work is Southampton, . . . the criticism of him as the personification of licentiousness would have been thoroughly applauded. The heroine is

¹ Instead of ascribing the poem to Roydon, Bradbrook (pp. 169 f.) makes it a collaboration; "the various members of the school each added a portion to the riposte." This fact accounts for the "striking . . . disjointedness" of the poem.

² [A similar suggestion had been made earlier by WOLFF (*E. S.*, 1916, L, 155). Wright finds evidence for his view in *Penelope's Complaint*.]

precisely the sort to appeal to the bourgeoisie, then and now." He suggests that the poem may have been "interpreted as a protest against some of the chivalric absurdities of the sonneteers," which must often have offended "bourgeois respectability."

Those who subscribe to Henry Willobie's authorship of the poem received fresh support in 1937 from HOTSON (*I, William Sh.*, pp. 157-70). Hotson finds no connection between *Willobie His Avis*a and the sonnets "except the references to Shakespeare's experience of love-affairs, the most recent of which was an unfortunate folly that amused his friends." "It is clear enough" that Henry Willoughby of Wiltshire and St. John's was the author, and "offhand, it certainly seems that Willoughby's W. S. may well be the Stratford poet," for no other suitable identification has been made. "What we should like to have is some link, ulterior to the evidence of the poem, between Shakespeare . . . and Willoughby." This link Hotson finds in Thomas Russell, the overseer of Sh.'s will, whose sister-in-law married Willoughby's elder brother. Through their common friend Russell, Willoughby and Sh. met during the former's Oxford days, and Willoughby came "to admire and emulate . . . [Sh.'s] success with . . . [*Venus*]. In 1594, after the publication of *The Rape of Lucrece*, Willoughby's chamber-fellow at Oxford who signs himself 'Hadrian Dorrell' brought out *Avisa*." The verses signed "Vigilantius: Dormitanus" were written by two Oxford students, Robert Wakeman and Edmund Napper. Thus in the volume "we can catch the forward wits of the university seeking his [Sh.'s] company, and gaining a footing easy enough to permit convivial quips about his attacks on women's hearts."

Other members of the group which accepts Willobie's authorship are FRIPP (*Sh. Man and Artist*, 1938, I, 372-379), B. R. LEWIS (*Sh. Documents*, 1940, I, 195), and BROOKE (*Essays in Honor of Albert Feuillerat*, 1943, pp. 93-102). The young Oxford student, Fripp conjectures, perhaps met Sh. in 1592 and took "a great fancy to . . . [him] as any spirited young aristocrat might do, with wisdom enough to recognize the earnestness behind the nonsense." He was familiar with Sh.'s "saucy poem . . . [*P. P.*, XVIII] and certain of his sonnet effusions lamenting his lady's cruelty. Adopting the verse of the former effort he wove his story . . . of the admired 'Avisa,' the handsome, pleasing, but 'precise' wife of the host of the George Inn at Sherborne in Dorset." Lewis's "simplified and sane explanation" makes Willobie the author and Hadrian Dorrell probably a fiction. "The entire affair was thus a conventional and literary hoax. With a degree of safety it may be concluded that 'W. S.' was" Sh. Brooke also inclines to the interpretation of "Hadrian Dorrell" as "a name invented by Willobie, who, under cover of it, wrote the prefaces himself." The W. S. section "may be a personal reference to Shakespeare, or may be only another tribute to the provocative character of *Venus and Adonis*."

An entirely new identification of *Avisa* was proposed in 1937 by PAULINE K. ANGELL (*P. M. L. A.*, 1937, LII, 652-674). Interpreting the mention of Oxford in the preface as an indication not of the locale of the story but of *Avisa*'s identity, she named as her candidate Elizabeth Trentham, second wife of the seventeenth Earl of Oxford, who is libeled in *Willobie His Avis*a for having distributed her favors to Southampton and Sh. It is impossible to summarize in

short space Angell's arguments ("no one item . . . taken by itself," she says [p. 653], "is conclusive; it is the cumulative effect which is impressive"); the interested reader may examine them for himself. Her theory, she believes (pp. 668 f.), explains the history of the text. In 1593 Lady Oxford had given birth to a son, Oxford's only male heir. It was important to prevent any question as to his claim to the title. Hence the proposed editions in 1596 and 1599 were censored. The edition of 1605 appeared in the year following Oxford's death, that of 1635 upon the death of another member of the family.¹

Few writers of late have conceded the obviousness of the parallel between the story of the sonnets and that of *Willobie His Avis*a. Many who believe, like FRAYNE WILLIAMS (*Mr. Sh.*, 1941, pp. 212-215), that W. S. is almost certainly Sh. and W. H. probably Southampton can see, like him, no similarity between *Avisa* and the dark woman. More would agree with DAVID HARDMAN (*What about Sh.*, 1938, pp. 47 f.) that students of the sonnets can find in *Willobie His Avis*a nothing more than a probable reference to Sh. as W. S. (though even this, as SPENCER [*Art and Life*, 1940, p. 116] points out, is "certainly not demonstrable"). Perhaps most readers of *Willobie His Avis*a will agree with HARRISON (ed. 1938, p. 14) that the poem is "as great a puzzle as the Sonnets," and will despair of attempting to elucidate *obscurum per obscurius*.²

¹ See T. W. BALDWIN's objections and ANGELL's replies in *P. M. L. A.*, 1940, LV, 598-602.

² *Willobie His Avis*a has not escaped the attention of the non-Stratfordians. For example, LATHAM DAVIS (*Sh. England's Ulysses*, 1905, p. 40 n.), who believes that "Sh." (and "Willobie") was the second Earl of Essex, says that Robert Chester's Phoenix and Willobie's Avis "are neither bird, woman nor person but dual allegories for the dismantled Masque published under the name of *Shake-speare's Sonnets* in 1609" (see pp. 106 f., above). PARKER WOODWARD (*Baconiana*, January, 1913, pp. 15-21) declares that the poem was written by the same man who wrote *Venus, Lucrece*, and the plays—that is, Francis Bacon. According to R. M. LUCAS (*Sh.'s Vital Secret*, 1937, p. 94), a Derbyite, "Henry Willobie was the real Henry Willoughby of West Knoyle . . . , and . . . he wrote about two other university men . . . —Will Stanley and . . . Henry Wriothlesley." For a novelist's interpretation of the mystery see JOHN BROPHY's *Gentleman of Stratford*, 1939, pp. 185-187.

APPENDIX XII

MUSICAL SETTINGS¹

The most inclusive bibliographies of musical settings for the sonnets are to be found in GREENHILL, HARRISON, and FURNIVALL's *List of All the Songs & Passages in Sh. Which Have Been Set to Music*, revised ed., 1884, and TANNENBAUM, 1940. In the following notes, which correct and enlarge both lists, references given by Tannenbaum are distinguished by asterisks (*). The principal American libraries have been canvassed, but it has been impossible to check the holdings of those in Great Britain. Thanks are due WILLIAM C. SMITH, of the British Museum staff, who has kindly supplied information about a few elusive settings. Entries which yet remain unverified are so noted.

Although songs from the plays have constantly attracted composers, musical interest in Sh.'s non-dramatic poetry has been confined almost entirely to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. ROY LAMSON, JR.'s "Musical Settings for the Poems" (Sh.'s *Poems*, 1938, pp. 610-621) reflects the unbroken popularity of "Come Live with Me," but otherwise it calls attention to only a few scattered glees and solo songs antedating 1800. The case is the same for the sonnets. HENRY LAWES set 116 in the mid-seventeenth century; OLDYS in his manuscript notes (under "Shakespeare") to Langbaine's *Account of the English Dramatick Poets*, 1691, asserts that "John [Dowland?] and Thos. Morley are said to have set several of these sonnets" to music—pieces which, if they ever existed, are still fugitive. Except for this slight activity, real and presumptive, the sonnets were apparently unknown to composers until SIR HENRY ROWLEY BISHOP (1786-1855) began to adapt their texts for his pastiche Shakespearean "operas."

RICHARD SIMPSON, who also wrote *The Philosophy of Sh.'s Sonnets*, is the one man to have set all the sonnets to music. His scores remained in manuscript during his lifetime, but in 1878 MRS. GEORGE MACFARREN selected thirteen for inclusion in a volume of his work. The rest remained unpublished, and it is not certain that the manuscript is still extant. Several other composers have shown considerable interest in the sonnets. ANTON BEER-WALBRUNN set a dozen, using German texts; SIR C. H. H. PARRY employed both English and German texts in several solo songs; and GRACE WASSALL included a number of sonnet settings in *A Sh. Song Cycle*. At least forty-nine of the sonnets have received musical treatment. Of these, 18 has been set at least a dozen times; following it in popularity are 29 with six settings and 71 and 109 with five each. Obliquely inspired by the sonnets is "The Dark Lady," the third variation in JAROMIR WEINBERGER's orchestral suite, *Under the Spreading Chestnut Tree*, 1939.

In the treatment of text, there are two well-defined historical phases.

¹ This section was contributed by my friend and colleague, CLAUDE M. SIMPSON, JR., now a lieutenant in the United States Naval Reserve.

BISHOP and his contemporaries, notably JOHN BRAHAM and CHARLES E. HORN, freely telescoped, transposed, and paraphrased Sh.'s words, and did not hesitate to introduce non-Shakespearean language. See, for example, Bishop's handling of "How like a winter" under 25, below. More recent composers, however, have almost always set entire sonnets, following the text faithfully, often with little regard for inequalities of lyric fluency. Despite the unjustified violence done to the texts by early nineteenth-century composers, some of their songs are musically superior to those whose authors seem to be overawed by their association with the immortal poet. It is significant that no one of the stature of Schubert, Fauré, or Wolf has been attracted by the sonnets, and it must be admitted that scarcely a single genuinely distinguished song to a sonnet text has been produced by those who have tried their hand. When CHRISTOPHER WILSON (*Sh. and Music*, 1922, p. 159) suggested the formation of a society for the protection of sonnets, he was keenly aware of the pitfalls attendant on vocalizing the tightly packed and often highly "conceited" text.

In the following notes the operas of Sir Henry Rowley Bishop have been referred to by their short titles. For their full titles see GREENHILL, pp. xxi-xxiii. Unless otherwise noted, the settings are for solo voice with pianoforte accompaniment.

5

- *1878 Richard Simpson, "Those hours that with gentle work did frame," *Sonnets of Sh. . . . and Miscellaneous Songs* (London: Stanley Lucas, Weber), pp. 1-5.

6

- *1878 Richard Simpson, "Then let not winter's ragged hand deface," *Sonnets of Sh. . . . and Miscellaneous Songs* (London: Stanley Lucas, Weber), pp. 6-12.

7

- *1824 Sir Henry Rowley Bishop, "Lo! in the Orient, when the gracious light," *As You Like It*, pp. 54-60. (A.T.T.B., lines 1-8.) Reprinted in Bishop's *Complete Collection of . . . Glees . . . and Choruses*, 1839, VII, 194-200.
- *1878 Richard Simpson, "Lo in the Orient," *Sonnets of Sh. . . . and Miscellaneous Songs* (London: Stanley Lucas, Weber), pp. 13-18.

18

- *1821 Charles Edward Horn, "Shall I compare thee?" *The Songs . . . in The Tempest*. (Duet: S.A., lines 1-4, 13 f.) Not seen: from Tannenbaum (no. 361), who follows Greenhill, p. 80. Reissued as a single sheet, n. d. (copy in the Boston Public Library, SP39, no. 28), and later in *The Sh. Vocal Magazine*, no. 75 (London: C. Lonsdale, 1871). The last line reads: "So long lives love, and love gives life to thee."
- *1841 Edward James Loder, *The Melophon. A Monthly Album of Vocal and Pianoforte Music* (London: Sherwood), pp. 81-84. (Duet: S.S., lines 1-4, 9-14.) Reissued as no. 5 of *Six New Vocal Duets* (London: Purday, 1843), with *Melophon* pagination retained; each duet has a separate title-page.

- *1850? John Reekes, "Shall I compare thee to a summer's day," *Six Songs . . . from . . . Sh.* (London: Addison and Hodson), pp. 10-12. (Lines 1-3, 9, and, unnoticed by Tannenbaum, 98.9-12.)
- *1876 Robert Hoar, *Shall I compare thee to a summer's day* (London: Hutchings and Romer).
- *1884? Lady Ramsey of Banff, [—] (London: Czerny). Not seen: from Tannenbaum (no. 370), who follows Greenhill, p. 80.
- *1887 Sir Charles Hubert Hastings Parry, "Sonnet XVIII," *Four Sonnets by Sh.* (London: Stanley Lucas, Weber), pp. 12-17. The text is in German (Bodenstedt's) and English; each version has its own musical score.
- *1893 Sir Alexander Campbell Mackenzie, *Shall I Compare Thee* (London: Robert Cocks). Reprinted in Mackenzie's *Three of Sh.'s Sonnets* (London: Augener, n. d.), pp. 12-17.
- 1893 J. H. Parry, "Shall I Compare Thee," *Novello's Part-Song Book*, no. 593 (London: Novello, Ewer), pp. 2-7. (S.A.T.B.)
- *1899? Madeleine Peck Taylor, *Shall I compare thee to a summer's day?* (Copenhagen: Wilhelm Hansen).
- 1901 Ernest Torrence, *Beyond Compare* (London: Boosey).
- *1904 Grace Wassall, "Shall I Compare Thee," *A Sh. Song Cycle* (Cincinnati: John Church), 1st ed., pp. 25-30; 2d ed., pp. 43-48. The cycle was first presented in Carnegie Hall, November 17, 1904, with the celebrated Mme. Johanna Gadski as one of the featured artists.
- *1917 Robert de Bruce, "Sonnet XVIII," *Frankincense* (San Francisco: privately printed), pp. [11-15]. A descriptive folder speaks of this cycle of songs as "a commentary in music upon an aspect of the poet's thought . . . which has received its most ample and uninterrupted treatment in the Sonnets—Friendship." The preface adds, "In the rapture, as it were, of spontaneous improvisation," the singer "passes freely from tone to tone in the gamut of his heart's compulsion."

25

- *1821 Sir Henry Rowley Bishop, "How like a winter," *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, pp. 81-91. This piece offers an excellent illustration of Bishop's freedom with the Sh. text. It contains a soprano setting of 97.1-4 (pp. 81 f.); a chorus, freely altered from *As You Like It*, V.iv, "Good Duke, receive thy daughter" (pp. 83 f., 86 f., 90 f.); a solo for a second soprano, based upon 25.1-4 (pp. 84 f.); and a duet in which the two sopranos sing their original texts simultaneously (pp. 88 f.). A single musical subject, "from one of Mr. B.'s Overtures," serves for the entire number.
- 1907 Anton Beer-Walbrunn, "Let those who are in favour with their stars," *Ein Cyklus . . . nach Sh.'s Sonetten* (Munich: Heinrich Lewy), I, 11-14 (Bodenstedt's translation).

27

- *1878 Richard Simpson, "Weary with Toil," *Sonnets of Sh. . . . and Miscellaneous Songs* (London: Stanley Lucas, Weber), pp. 19-25.

29

- *1821 Sir Henry Rowley Bishop, "When in disgrace with fortune," *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, pp. 37-43. ("Solo brillante," as sung by Miss Tree. Lines 1-4, 9-12.)
- *1887 Sir Charles Hubert Hastings Parry, "Sonnet XXIX," *Four Sonnets by Sh.* (London: Stanley Lucas, Weber), pp. 1-5. The text is in German (Bodenstedt's) and English.
- *1893 Sir Alexander Campbell Mackenzie, *When in Disgrace* (London: Robert Cocks). Reprinted in Mackenzie's *Three of Sh.'s Sonnets* (London: Augener, n. d.), pp. 2-6.
- *1904 Grace Wassall, "When in Disgrace," *A Sh. Song Cycle* (Cincinnati: John Church), 1st ed., pp. 63-67; 2d ed., pp. 67-71.
- *1913 Rex de Cairos-Rego, *Love's Recompense* (London: G. Schrimpton). Reprinted in de Cairos-Rego's *Two Sonnets of Sh.* (London: G. Schrimpton, 1913). Tannenbaum (no. 376) gives the composer's name as "Rogo."
- 1923 Marx E. Oberndorfer, "When in Disgrace," [*Two*] *Songs* (New York: J. Fischer), pp. 2-6.

30

- 1879 H. M. Corbett, *Remembrance*. ("Compass from lower B to upper A.") Not seen: from Greenhill, p. 82.
- *1887 Sir Charles Hubert Hastings Parry, "Sonnet XXX," *Four Sonnets by Sh.* (London: Stanley Lucas, Weber), pp. 18-24. The text is in German (Bodenstedt's) and English.
- 1904 Grace Wassall, *Remembrance* (Cincinnati: John Church). Reprinted in *Wassall's *A Sh. Song Cycle* (Cincinnati: John Church, 2d ed., 1904), pp. 56-59.
- *1917 Robert de Bruce, "Sonnet XXX," *Frankincense* (San Francisco: privately printed), pp. [5-9].

33

- *1820 Sir Henry Rowley Bishop, "Full many a glorious morning," *Twelfth Night*, pp. 1-4. (Lines 1-4, 9-12.) A version of 33, probably this one, was sung by Miss Tree at a "Grand Vocal and Instrumental Concert" following a performance of *Cymbeline*, June 19, 1822 (see Henry Brown, *Sh.'s Patrons*, 1912, p. 111).
- *1850? John Reekes, "Full many a glorious morning," *Six Songs . . . from . . . Sh.* (London: Addison and Hodson), pp. 24-33. (Lines 1-4, 9-12.) The text has the following changes:

- 3. Kissing] Painting
- 12. hath] has

40

- *1820 Sir Henry Rowley Bishop, "Take all my loves," *Twelfth Night*, pp. 45-47. (A "cavatina" for soprano, lines 1-4.)
- *1821 Charles Edward Horn, "Take all my loves," *The Songs . . . in The Tempest*. (T. or B.) Not seen: from Tannenbaum (no. 383), who follows Greenhill, p. 83. Reissued in 1825 as a single sheet (London:

Cramer, Addison and Beale); the same plates were used for a reprint in *The Sh. Vocal Magazine*, no. 73, 1871. The text employs lines 1-8 and two non-Shakespearean quatrains.

43

- *1930 Henri Sauguet, "Je te vois en rêve," *Deux poèmes de Sh.* (Paris: J. Jobert), pp. 1-5.

44

- 1879 Charles Kensington Salaman, *Thought* (London: Stanley Lucas, Weber). Reissued in Salaman's *Half a Century of Song, 1836-1886*, n. d., from the original plates (all songs separately paged).

53

- *1917 Robert de Bruce, "Sonnet LIII," *Frankincense* (San Francisco: privately printed), pp. [17-21].

54

- *1820 Sir Henry Rowley Bishop, "O, how much more doth beauty," *Twelfth Night*, pp. 65-67. (A "cavatina" for soprano, lines 1-4.)
 1853 George Barker, "Oh how much more," *George Barker's Ballad Album* (London: Addison and Holber), pp. 22-27. Greenhill gives the date as 1870.
 1866 [Frederick Lygon,] Earl Beauchamp, "Oh how much more doth beauty beauteous seem" (London: Novello). (A.T.T.B., lines 1-12.) This glee, according to Greenhill, p. 85, "gained the 2nd prize at the Noblemen's and Gentlemen's Catch Club [June 22, 1866]."

55

- 1907 Anton Beer-Walbrunn, "Not marble, nor the gilded monuments of princes," *Ein Cyklus . . . nach Sh.'s Sonetten* (Munich: Heinrich Lewy), II, 12-15 (Gildemeister's translation).

57

- *1821 Charles Edward Horn, "Being your slave, what should I do," *The Songs . . . in The Tempest*. (T. or B.) Not seen: from Tannenbaum (no. 387), who follows Greenhill, p. 85. Alden (ed. 1916, p. 483) erroneously lists this as a setting of 62, following Helen A. Clarke, "A List of Sh. Operas, Operatised Dramas, and Overtures," *Shakespeareana*, 1888, V, 543 f. A setting in *The Sh. Vocal Magazine*, no. 72, 1871, is presumably a reissue of the original song. The text is made up of lines 1-4 and 60.1-4.

58

- *1878 Richard Simpson, "That god forbid," *Sonnets of Sh. . . . and Miscellaneous Songs* (London: Stanley Lucas, Weber), pp. 26-30.

59

- *1878 Richard Simpson, "If there be nothing new," *Sonnets of Sh. . . . and Miscellaneous Songs* (London: Stanley Lucas, Weber), pp. 31-36.

60

- 1828 Thomas Simpson Cooke, "The Gamut Duet," *The Taming of the Shrew* (London: I. Willis), II, 28-36. Following four pages of non-Shakespearean text, the second half of this soprano-tenor duet (II, 33-36) is set to lines 1-4. Issued also as a single sheet.
- 1871 Charles Edward Horn, "Being your slave, what should I do," *The Sh. Vocal Magazine*, no. 72, 1871. This is presumably a reprint of a song in *The Tempest*, 1821. The text is made up of 57.1-4 and 60.1-4. The latter quatrain has the following change:

4. sequent] frequent

61

- *1887? Sir Alexander Campbell Mackenzie, *Is it thy will?* (London: Chappell, n. d.). Sung at a meeting of the New Sh. Society, May 13, 1887 (*N. Sh. S. T.*, 1886-1889, Appendix, pp. 4, 20 f.).

63

- *1878 Richard Simpson, "Against my love shall be as I am now," *Sonnets of Sh. . . and Miscellaneous Songs* (London: Stanley Lucas, Weber), pp. 37-42. The text has the following changes:

2. ore-worne] out worn
9. I now] now I
10. knife] strife

64

- *1821 Sir Henry Rowley Bishop, "When I have seen the hungry ocean gain," *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, pp. 7-10. (Lines 5-12.) Alden, following Clarke (see the note under 57), erroneously lists this as 84.

65

- *1904 Grace Wassall, "Since Brass, nor Stone," *A Sh. Song Cycle* (Cincinnati: John Church), 1st ed., pp. 37-40; 2d ed., pp. 34-37.

71

- 1841 Edward James Loder, *The Melophon. A Monthly Album of Vocal and Pianoforte Music* (London: Sherwood), pp. 154-158. (Duet: S.S., lines 1-8.) Reissued as no. 3 of *Six New Vocal Duets* (London: Purday, 1843), with *Melophon* pagination retained; each duet has a separate title-page.
- *1878 Richard Simpson, "No longer mourn," *Sonnets of Sh. . . and Miscellaneous Songs* (London: Stanley Lucas, Weber), pp. 43-49. The text has the following changes:
2. sullen] solemn
6. writ] wrote
- 1886 Sir Charles Hubert Hastings Parry, "No longer mourn for me," *English Lyrics, Second Set* (London: Stanley Lucas, Weber). Another edition (London: Novello, 189-?), pp. 10-15.

- 188-? C. Holland, *The Triumph of Death* (London: Novello, Ewer, n. d.). (S.A.T.B.)
- 1907 Anton Beer-Walbrunn, "No longer mourn for me when I am dead," *Ein Cyklus . . . nach Sh.s Sonetten* (Munich: Heinrich Lewy), II, 6-8 (Bodenstedt's translation).

73

- *1821 Sir Henry Rowley Bishop, "That time of year," *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, pp. 11-13; another ed., n. d., pp. 59-61. (Lines 1-8.) Tannenbaum gives the date as "1921."
- *1878 Richard Simpson, "That time of year," *Sonnets of Sh. . . . and Miscellaneous Songs* (London: Stanley Lucas, Weber), pp. 50-55. The text has the following change:

2. none] some

74

- 1907 Anton Beer-Walbrunn, "But be contented when that fell arrest," *Ein Cyklus . . . nach Sh.s Sonetten* (Munich: Heinrich Lewy), II, 9-11. (Lines 1-12 from Gildemeister's translation, lines 13 f. from Bodenstedt's.)

75

- 1907 Anton Beer-Walbrunn, "So are you to my thoughts as food to life," *Ein Cyklus . . . nach Sh.s Sonetten* (Munich: Heinrich Lewy), I, 19-22 (Bodenstedt's translation).

81

- *1878 Richard Simpson, "Or I shall live your epitaph to make," *Sonnets of Sh. . . . and Miscellaneous Songs* (London: Stanley Lucas, Weber), pp. 56-62.

87

- *1850? John Reekes, "Farewell! thou art too dear for my possessing," *Six Songs . . . from . . . Sh.* (London: Addison and Hodson), pp. 1-3. The text of this song includes not only 87.1-4, but also, unnoticed by Tannenbaum, 97.11-14 and four non-Shakespearean lines.
- *1879 Luigi Caracciolo, [—] (Milan: Ricordi). Not seen: from Tannenbaum (no. 399), who follows Greenhill, p. 89.
- *1887 Sir Charles Hubert Hastings Parry, "Sonnet LXXXVII," *Four Sonnets by Sh.* (London: Stanley Lucas, Weber), pp. 6-11. The text is in German (Bodenstedt's) and English.

90

- *1904 Grace Wassall, "Then hate me if thou wilt," *A Sh. Song Cycle* (Cincinnati: John Church), 1st and 2d eds., pp. 12-15.

91

- *1904 Grace Wassall, "Some glory in their birth," *A Sh. Song Cycle* (Cincinnati: John Church), 1st ed., pp. 53-55; 2d ed., pp. 25-27.

92

- *1821 Sir Henry Rowley Bishop, "Say tho' you strive to steal yourself away," *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, pp. 14-21; another ed., n. d., pp. 11-18. Issued also as a single sheet (London: Goulding D'Almaine, Potter, n. d.). (Duet by Julia, soprano, and the non-Shakespearean Philipppo, baritone, lines 1-4, 9-12.) The text has the following changes:

1. But . . . selfe] Say though you strive to steal yourself
3. thy] my

96

- *1878 Richard Simpson, "Some say thy fault is youth," *Sonnets of Sh. . . . and Miscellaneous Songs* (London: Stanley Lucas, Weber), pp. 63-67.

97

- *1821 Sir Henry Rowley Bishop, "How like a winter," *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, pp. 81-91. (97.1-4 and 25.1-4.) For details of this pastiche, see under 25.
- 1823 Charles Edward Horn, "With thee, fair summer's joys appear," *Songs, Duets, Chorusses, &c. in The Merry Wives of Windsor*. Lines 11-14 and parts of 98 and 99 are loosely paraphrased. The relevant part of Horn's text is as follows:

With thee, fair summer's joys appear,
O sweet Anne Page!
But thou away, dread winter's near,
And all around is dark and drear,—
The leaves look pale and shepherds mourn,
All nature droops till you return!

- *1850? John Reekes, "Farewell! Thou art too dear for my possessing," *Six Songs . . . from . . . Sh.* (London: Addison and Hodson), pp. 1-3. (Lines 11-14, as well as 87.1-4 and a scrap of non-Shakespearean text.) The following changes are made:

11. his] its
14. looke] turn
the Winters] winter's

98

- 1823 Charles Edward Horn, "With thee, fair summer's joys appear," *Songs, Duets, Chorusses, &c. in The Merry Wives of Windsor*. Lines 13 f. and parts of 97 and 99 are loosely paraphrased. The relevant part of Horn's text is as follows:

Yet though 'tis winter, thou away,
Still these thy shadows make it May.

- 1850? John Reekes, "Shall I compare thee to a summer's day," *Six Songs . . . from . . . Sh.* (London: Addison and Hodson), pp. 10-12. The text of

this song includes 18.1-3, 9, and, unnoticed by Tannenbaum, 98.9-12. The text has the following changes:

- 9. Nor did I] I do not
- 10. in the] of the budding
- 11. weare] are
sweet] sweets

- 1892 Hastings Crossley, "Absence," *Three Duets for Soprano and Tenor* (London: Novello, Ewer). Issued as a single sheet.

99

- 1823 Charles Edward Horn, "With thee, fair summer's joys appear," *Songs, Duets, Chorusses, &c. in The Merry Wives of Windsor*. Lines 14 f. and parts of 97 and 98 are loosely paraphrased. The relevant part of Horn's text is as follows:

And violets bloom, Ah! none I see,
But sweets or colours stolen from thee!

- *1893 Sir Alexander Campbell Mackenzie, *The Forward Violet* (London: Robert Cocks). Reprinted in Mackenzie's *Three of Sh.'s Sonnets* (London: Augener, n. d.), pp. 7-11, and also in the *Monthly Musical Record*, 1916, XLVI, 113-116.

102

- 1828 Thomas Simpson Cooke, "Our Love Was New," *The Taming of the Shrew* (London: I. Willis), II, 1-7. (Lines 5-14.) Issued also as a single sheet.

104

- *1917 Robert de Bruce, "Sonnet CIV," *Frankincense* (San Francisco: privately printed), pp. [23-29].

105

- 1898 Liza Lehmann, *Fair, Kind, and True* (London: Chappell). Printed in versions for high, medium, and low voice.
- *1917 Robert de Bruce, "Sonnet CV," *Frankincense* (San Francisco: privately printed), pp. [31-37].

109

- *1821 Sir Henry Rowley Bishop, "Oh never say that I was false of heart," *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, pp. 22-27; another ed., pp. 19-24. (A bravura song for coloratura soprano, lines 1-4, 13 f.) The text has the following changes:

- 4. thy] my
- 14. Rose . . . art] love, thou art in it

- *182-? Matthew Peter King, "Oh never say that," *The Apollo, or Harmonist in Miniature* (London, n. d.), VIII, 612-617. (Glee for three voices,

lines 1-6, 13 f.) I have not seen a version with accompaniment, mentioned by Tannenbaum, following Greenhill, who in turn followed Roffe (*Handbook*, 1878, p. 107). The text has the following changes:

5. That . . . loue] Omitted

14. Rose] love

- *1835? Charles Arnold, *Oh! never say that I was false of heart!* (London: George Walker). (Lines 1-4, followed by a non-Shakespearean quatrain.)
- *1869 Alberto Randegger, *The Unchangeable* (London: Hutchings and Romer).
- *1907 Sir Charles Hubert Hastings Parry, "Oh, never say that I was false of heart," *English Lyrics, Seventh Set* (London: Novello), pp. 15-18. Issued also as a single sheet.

110

- *1878 Richard Simpson, "Alas 'tis true," *Sonnets of Sh. . . . and Miscellaneous Songs* (London: Stanley Lucas, Weber), pp. 68-73.
- *1878 Richard Simpson, "Alas 'tis true," the same, pp. 74-78. A second version.

116

- 165-? Henry Lawes, "Selfe blinding error seazeth all those mindes," in John Gamble's manuscript commonplace book of songs (1659?), New York Public Library, Drexel 4257. (Air with bass.) Printed in facsimile by Willa McClung Evans, *Henry Lawes*, 1941, p. 43; see also her article, "Lawes' Version of Sh.'s Sonnet CXVI," *P.M.L.A.*, 1936, LI, 120-122. Couplets have been added to the first and second quatrains, creating a three-stanza poem with the rime scheme *ababcc*. Since Lawes asserted that "the way of *composition* I chiefly profess . . . is to shape *Notes* to the *Words* and *Sense*," the source of the present text must remain uncertain. The poem is as follows (departures from the Sh. text are italicized):

*Selfe blinding error seazeth all those mindes:
who with falce Appellations call that loue
w^{ch} alters when it alteration findes
or with the mouer hath a power to moue
not much vnlike y^e hereticks p^retence
that scites trew scripture but p^reuents the sence:*

Oh noe *Loue* is an euer fixed marke
That lookes on tempests *but* is neuer shaken
It is the starr to euery wandring barke
Whose worth's vnknowne although his height be taken
*Noe mowntebanke with eie-deludeing flashes
But flameing Martyr in his holly ashes*

Loue's not tymes foole though Rosie lipps & Cheekes
Within his *bynding Circle* compas rownd

Loue alters not with his breife howers & weekes
 But *holds* it out euen to the edge of doome
 If this be errour & *not truth approu'd*
Cupids noe God nor Man *nere* lou'd

- *1828 John Braham, "True Love," *The Taming of the Shrew* (London: I. Willis), I, 11-19. (Duet: S.T., lines 5-12.) Issued also as a single sheet. Tannenbaum (no. 415) follows Greenhill, p. 92, in misquoting the title, "Love is an ever-fixed mark," and misnumbering the lines "5-14." The errors seem to have been made originally by Roffe (*Handbook*, p. 107). The text has the following alteration:

5. O no, it] True love

- 1907 Anton Beer-Walbrunn, "Let me not to the marriage of true minds," *Ein Cyklus . . . nach Sh.s Sonetten* (Munich: Heinrich Lewy), I, 15-18. The text is a composite of the Bodenstedt and Gildemeister translations.

123

- *1824 Sir Henry Rowley Bishop, "Oh Time! thou shalt not boast that I do change!" *As You Like It*, pp. 18-24. (Lines 1-4, 13 f.) The text has the following changes:

1. No] Oh
 13. this shall] I will
 14. I will be] To friendship

128

- 1907 Anton Beer-Walbrunn, "How oft, when thou, my music, music play'st," *Ein Cyklus . . . nach Sh.s Sonetten* (Munich: Heinrich Lewy), I, 6-10 (Gildemeister's translation).

130

- 1907 Anton Beer-Walbrunn, "My mistress' eyes are nothing like the sun," *Ein Cyklus . . . nach Sh.s Sonetten* (Munich: Heinrich Lewy), I, 3-5 (Gildemeister's translation).

139

- *1810? John Davy, "Madrigal III," *Six Madrigals for Four Voices* (London: J. Balls), pp. 15-19. (S.S.T.B., lines 1-6.)

146

- 1907 Anton Beer-Walbrunn, "Poor soul, the centre of my sinful earth," *Ein Cyklus . . . nach Sh.s Sonetten* (Munich: Heinrich Lewy), II, 3-5 (Gildemeister's translation).

147

- 1907 Anton Beer-Walbrunn, "My love is as a fever, longing still," *Ein Cyklus . . . nach Sh.s Sonetten* (Munich: Heinrich Lewy), I, 23-27 (Gildemeister's translation).

148

- *1824 Sir Henry Rowley Bishop, "Ah me! what eyes hath love put in my head?" *As You Like It*, pp. 15-17. (Lines 1-12.)

149

- *1810? John Davy, "Madrigal IV," *Six Madrigals for Four Voices* (London, J. Balls), pp. 20-25. (S.A.T.B., lines 1-12.)

APPENDIX XIII

THE VOGUE OF THE SONNETS

GREAT BRITAIN

The vogue of Elizabethan sonnets ended a decade or more before Sh.'s were published. Too many would-be Petrarchs and Ronsards had spoiled the poetic brew. By 1609 their lyrics were usually regarded as old-fashioned or ridiculous, and perhaps many Jacobean readers endorsed THOMAS CAMPION's epigram (*Observations*, 1602, P. Vivian's *Campion*, 1909, p. 37), "in *Quatorzens* . . . the Poet handles his subject as tyrannically as *Procrustes* . . . his prisoners, whom, when he had taken, he vsed to cast vpon a bed, which if they were too short to fill, he would stretch them longer, if too long, he would cut them shorter," and the remark of his imitator BEN JONSON, who (*Conversations*, ed. G. B. Harrison, 1923, p. 5) in talking with sonneteer Drummond of Hawthornden in 1619 tactlessly "cursed Petrarch for redacting Verses to Sonnets, which he said were like that Tirrants bed, wher some who were too short were racked, others too long cut short."¹ Nobody has ever surpassed Sh. at following, while improving upon, current fashions. He must have been annoyed to find himself featured in 1609² as the author of an elaborate collection of old-style quatorzains that he had carefully hidden from the public gaze at the very time when almost everybody else was reading or writing sonnets.

The contrast between the popularity of Sh.'s two narrative poems and the unpopularity of his sonnets is striking. Both *Venus* and *Lucrece* were reprinted many times, the former reaching at least a seventeenth edition by 1675, the latter at least a ninth by 1655; whereas the sonnets had no second edition, though a partial and garbled reissue, along with miscellaneous poems by Sh. and others, was published in 1640. MATHEW (*Image of Sh.*, 1922, p. 114) suggested that "the neglect of the *Sonnets* of 1609 can only be explained by concluding that they were quickly suppressed," at the urgency of Southampton, to prevent readers from gloating over what appeared to be scandalous revelations. ROBERTSON (*Problems*, 1926, p. 121) borrowed the suggestion. Q, he wrote, "is now a very rare book; yet the natural presumption would be that in 1609, at the height of Shakespeare's contemporary fame, it would have found a considerable sale if it were not interfered with; and that a second edi-

¹ LEE (*Athenaeum*, July 9, 1904, p. 49) asserts that Jonson borrowed the idea from Stefano Guazzo's words (*Dialoghi piaceuoli*, 1587, no. 7, sig. N3), "It seems to me that Signor Claudio Tolomei had reason for saying that the sonnet was like the bed of Procrustes. . . . Since it is almost impossible to find a subject which exactly fills the frame of the sonnet, it is imperative either to add idle words, or to break off the conceits in such a manner that the composition becomes either feeble or obscure."

² *Troilus and Cressida* was published in this year, *King Lear* in 1608.

tion would have followed in a few years. . . . There is fair ground for a presumption that . . . [Q] was stopped, whether through the intervention of Shakespeare or another." Robertson's notions are plausible. Unless Q was quickly suppressed, how can one account for the total silence of Sh.'s contemporaries about the mysterious figures of the dark woman, the male friend, and the rival poet? Surely the first of these would have attracted at least as much attention and comment from readers as Sidney's Stella or Daniel's Delia.

References to *Venus* and *Lucrece* and quotations from them abound almost from their date of publication. Of these the earliest yet discovered came, as HOTSON has shown (*The [London] Times*, April 21, 1939, p. 19), from the pen of a madman, WILLIAM RENOLDES, on September 21, 1593. According to MUNRO's *Sh. Allusion-Book*, 1909, for the period ending 1700 *Venus* is, with *Romeo and Juliet*, fourth in popularity among Sh.'s works, *Lucrece* sixth. But that collection makes out a far poorer case for the sonnets. It gives seven so-called "allusions," but they include Thorpe's dedication of Q, an alleged imitation of 27 by DRUMMOND, and a manuscript copy of 8.¹ Even admitting that all seven are really "allusions," they come from the years 1598-1640, with not a single "allusion" from 1641 to 1700.² On the testimony of the *Sh. Allusion-Book*, then, the sonnets up to 1700 come next to the last in popularity of all Sh.'s works, being followed only by the *P. & T.*, the *L. C.*, and *Love's Labor Won* with one "allusion" each. Of course Munro's book is incomplete, but the scattering references to the sonnets before 1700 pointed out by other research students hardly affect the situation.

LEE (ed. 1905, p. 25) asserts that in 1594 and 1595 RICHARD BARNFIELD "levied loans on the sonnets," but the evidence (see the notes to 85 and 98) is dubious. The same thing is true of his further remark (p. 51) that "many reminiscences of Shakespeare's sonnets figure in Drummond's early sonnets and poems, which were first collected in 1616," though DRUMMOND apparently did read them shortly after 1609 (see L. E. Kastner's *Drummond*, 1913, I, xxx), and from Q he imitated a passage in its supplementary poem, the *L. C.*³

A poem unknown to the *Sh. Allusion-Book*, JOHN TRUSSELL's *Raptus I. Helenae; The First Rape of Faire Hellen*, registered at Stationers' Hall on April 16, 1595 (Arber, *Transcript*, 1875, II, 296), apparently has more significance. To it is prefixed a dedicatory sonnet that, according to A. S. W. ROSENBACH (*New York Times*, June 22, 1931, p. 21), "bears a remarkable resemblance in tone and language to some of Shakespeare's own sonnets." More interesting still, "although no name is mentioned in the dedicatory sonnet, according to the usual practice of that day, there can be no doubt, on the strength of the evidence, that Trussell's sonnet was addressed to Shakespeare, to whom alone Trussell was indebted for the plot and verse of his poem." The "sonnet" in question (it has eighteen lines) as reprinted in the *New York Times* (and also in the *T. L. S.*, July 9, 1931, p. 552) runs thus:

¹ MACKAIL (*Approach to Sh.*, 1930, p. 113) writes: "There are no contemporary references to it [Q]. 'More sonneteering' was apparently the only criticism passed on it."

² The *Sh. Allusion-Book* mentions an advertisement in 1658 of Benson's 1640 *Poems*.

³ See Sh.'s *Poems*, 1938, p. 334.

To praise thy worth or to applaud thy wit,
 Or to commend thy pleasing Poetrie:
 Were but to shew my insufficiencie,
 Which cannot equall what thy selfe hast writ.
 For thou maist challenge not unworthily,
 True Vertues merits, Fames eternitie,
 Upon thy browes perpetually to sit.
 Then what need I to laud thy Poesie
 (Which cannot pen thy praise effectuellie),
 Sith *Phoebus* Laurell will eternize it.
 Yet, though thy owne deserts sufficient be,
 To praise thy selfe without my praising thee,
 My praise cannot disparage thee a whit,
 Yet since our friendship and our amitie
 Commaunded me as much: (and hee,
Qui tua non laudat deteriora dabit)
 I have adventur'd, as each eye may see,
 To shame my selfe in seeking praise for thee.

Rosenbach shows that Trussell was a neighbor of Sh., "that his uncle lived at Stratford-on-Avon and that his family had been associated with the Shakespeares and Ardens for many years." He calls the *Raptus*, which I have been unable to see, "among the earliest of all the hundreds of poems, plays and prose works that owe their inspiration to Shakespeare." Unfortunately, the facsimile reprint of the book promised in 1931 has not yet materialized, and so scholars have been unable to make a final judgment about the dedication and the borrowings from Sh.

The most famous and the first direct reference to the sonnets, that of FRANCIS MERES in 1598, has been worn threadbare by incessant repetition. In "A comparatiue discourse of our English Poets, with the *Greeke, Latine, and Italian Poets*,"¹ added to *Palladis Tamia. Wits Treasury*, the pedestrian schoolmaster writes (sigs. 2O1^v-2O2): "As the soule of *Euphorbus* was thought to liue in *Pythagoras*: so the sweete wittie soule of *Ouid* liues in mellifluous & hony-tongued *Shakespeare*, witnes his *Venus* and *Adonis*, his *Lucrece*, his sugred Sonnets among his priuate friends, &c." How many of the sugared sonnets (OULTON [ed. 1804, I, xi] pleasantly misquotes as "sacred sonnets") were circulating in 1598 is an unsettled problem (see p. 54, above), but the "private friends" (one would like their names) jealously guarded the manuscripts. It is, none the less, a bit surprizing that ROBERT ALLOT, the indefatigable reader of manuscript as well as printed verse, failed to secure even one quotation from them for his anthology, *England's Parnassus*, 1600 (ed. Charles Crawford, 1913, p. 380).

LEE (ed. 1905, p. 52) reminds us that the sonnets "continued to circulate in manuscript as separate poems, with distinct headings, after, no less than before," 1609. But no manuscript copy earlier than 1609 is known today. Apparently all the copies that do survive are derived from Benson's 1640 edition—

¹ Its common, not learned, sources are discussed by D. C. ALLEN, *Francis Meres's Treatise "Poetrie,"* 1933.

though that does not destroy the merit of the "allusions." The fullest account of manuscript versions is that of BROOKE (ed. 1936, pp. vi, 66-69), who assembles information about sixteen seventeenth-century copies of ten sonnets (1, 2, 8, 32, 33, 68, 71, 106, 107, 116) and about a Folger Sh. Library manuscript¹ quoting twenty-three others from the 1640 volume.

It is strange that ROBERT BURTON, the great anatomist of love and melancholy, "had no copy of the *Sonnets*, nor does he quote or allude to them" (H. J. GOTTLIEB, *Robert Burton's Knowledge of English Poetry*, 1937, p. 14 n.), for he knew both *Venus* and *Lucrece*. They could have provided him with a rich chapter on the subject of abnormal love! MILTON shows no knowledge of them, nor, indeed, does any of the Cavalier poets except SUCKLING, who in *Brennoralt. A Tragedy*, about 1640, has lavish concealed quotations from half a dozen sonnets (see the notes to 9, 47, 52, 99, 104, 140). A possible quotation from 19.14—or from the old play of *The Reign of King Edward III*—was observed by G. THORN-DRURY (*Some Seventeenth Century Allusions*, 1920, p. 3) in R. JUNIUS (or Young's) *The Drunkard's Character*, 1638, sig. A7, "Putrified Lillies smell farre worse than weeds."

That thirty years after their publication the sonnets were forgotten is shown by BENSON's preface to Sh.'s *Poems* of 1640. He could never have hoped to deceive readers into thinking that *Venus* and *Lucrece* had not been published before 1640, but he does imply that the sonnets, written late in Sh.'s life, had not previously come to the press (see pp. 23-25, above). From his volume came the important, but garbled, quotations in JOSHUA POOLE's *English Parnassus*, 1657. Poole, a Cambridge M. A., compiled the book as an aid for his students in a private school at Hadley, near Barnet, Middlesex, and after his death it was published as a compendium for embryo poets. J. D., the prefacer, calls Part III (sig. a8) "an ample treasury of *phrases*, and elegant expressions, gathered out of the best esteemed English Authors that have writ in the severall kinds of Poesie, not unlike that of *Thesaurus Poeticus*, in Latine." The abundant borrowings from the sonnets, unnoticed in the *Sh. Allusion-Book*² but referred to by HENRY BROWN (*Sonnets of Sh.*, 1870, p. 28), occur in Part III, which is arranged with headings useful to versifiers. Brown observed that to the extracts from 1-4 Poole (p. 541) gave the title of "*The resolved fair Virgin*," changing (in Benson's own manner) Sh.'s *his* to *her*. But the changes were natural. Sh., a rare bird, is the only English poet so far to devote a long sequence of sonnets to a man, and no normal ancient or modern schoolmaster could, or would, think of citing for the imitation of schoolboys passages written by an older man to a "lovely boy." As examples, apparently not mentioned before, of Poole's method, I may cite the heading "*Musick.v.Sweet sounding*" with the quotation (p. 412) "true concord of well tuned sounds. / By unions married [8.5 f.], each string husband to the other [8.9]"; "*Old*," with (p. 431) "Envious time / Hath delv'd her paralels within her brow [60.10], / Forty winters have besieg'd the brow, / And dig'd deep trenches up in beauties field [2.1 f.], / When sable curls are silver'd o'r with white [12.4]"; "*Rose*," with

¹ It is discussed by M. H. LIDDELL in the *New York Nation*, 1902, LXXV, 10 f. For other manuscripts of the sonnets see the General Index.

² Which at II, 478 f., lists a few of Poole's quotations from the plays.

(p. 471) "The summers breath their masked buds discloseth [54.8]. / On whose soft cheek a deep Vermillion dwells [98.10, 99.4]"; and, finally, "*The spring*," with (p. 496)

When proud pyde April drest in all his trim,
Hath put a spirit of youth in every thing,
That heavy Saturn laught and leapt with him [98.2-4].
The summers front [102.7]. The foyzen of the year [53.9],
When nightingales do hush the silent night, . . .
And a wild musick burthens every bough [102.10 f.].

The 1640 *Poems* managed to keep the sonnets barely alive, though the word *sonnet* (which it nowhere used) seldom turns up. Thus EDWARD PHILLIPS, in his *Theatrum Poetarum*, 1675 (II, 194), refers to them as "other various Poems," saying that they, like all the rest of Sh.'s work, have "an unvulgar style." His comments were lifted unchanged into WILLIAM WINSTANLEY's *England's Worthies*, 1684 (p. 346). There is nothing in GERARD LANGBAIN'S *Account of the English Dramatick Poets*, 1691 (p. 467), or in his continuator CHARLES GILDON'S *Lives and Characters of the English Dramatick Poets*, 1699 (p. 129), to indicate that the two literary historians had read the sonnets. But the anonymous author of the novel *Eromena*, 1683 (THORN-DRURY, *Some Seventeenth Century Allusions*, 1920, p. 29), had a bowing acquaintance with them, and his dedication quotes 55 in a perverted text. By 1685 PHILLIPS, too, had read the 1640 volume with close attention, so that in *The Mysteries of Love & Eloquence* he begins "A Perswasive Letter to his Mistress"¹ with lines quoted or adapted from the final couplets of six sonnets (23, 6, 4, 5, 11, 92), adding verses presumably of his own composition:

Sweetest, but read what silent Love hath writ
With thy fair eyes, tast but of Loves fine wit,
Be not self will'd; for thou art much too fair,
For death to triumph o're without an heir;
Thy unus'd beauty, must be tomb'd with thee,
Which us'd, lives thy Executour to be;
The Flowers distill'd, though they with Winter meet
Lose but their show, their substance still is sweet.
Nature made thee her seal, she meant thereby:
Thou shouldst Print more, not let the Copie die. . . .
What is so fair that hath no little spot;
Come, come thou mayest be false yet know'st it not. . . .

For a long time literary historians believed that the sonnet as a type, though temporarily revived by MILTON, died in 1658, not to be resurrected until the middle of the next century. There have even been scholars to argue that BENSON dodged the word *sonnet* in his 1640 edition of Sh.'s poems because of

¹ No copy of the first edition, 1658, is accessible to me. I quote from the third edition "with Additions," sig. L5^v. Phillips has various other borrowings from Sh., as on sigs. 2B5 and 2C1^v, not noticed in the allusion books.

the general critical opprobrium attached to it.¹ Such beliefs are combated in C. B. MITCHELL's Harvard dissertation, *The English Sonnet in the Seventeenth Century*, 1939. Liberally defining a sonnet as a quatorzain of any rime scheme except couplets and of any length of line, Mitchell finds (pp. 36 f.) one hundred forty-four new "sonnets" appearing in the years from 1645 to 1700. Furthermore (pp. 130 f., 143), "the new sonnets of 1645-1700 were . . . but a small fraction" of all that were printed. In addition to them, "at least 570 individual sonnets appeared in reprint. More than half of these made only one such appearance; but almost 200 were republished three or more times," so that "this proverbially barren period witnessed the republication of more than 1200 sonnets." There were also (p. 160) various new translations of Italian, Spanish, French, and Portuguese sonnets. Mitchell proves that the ideas of sonnet form held in the seventeenth century are exactly like those of most eighteenth-century poets and critics. His study is an outgrowth of the now classic work of R. D. Havens.

In *The Influence of Milton*, 1922—a book from which a number of the illustrations in the following pages have been derived—HAVENS exploded, once and for all, the commonly held notion that "Pope's mentor," WILLIAM WALSH's "Sonnet. Death" of 1692 was the only lyric of the sort composed in English between MILTON's last sonnet of 1658 and WARTON's first of 1750. To Havens's account further details have been added by G. F. EVANS, A. D. MCKILLOP, and R. A. AUBIN (*M. L. N.*, 1924, XXXIX, 184 f., 439 f.; 1934, XLIX, 507-509). Evans calls attention to an anonymous sonnet on Death published in 1735; McKillop, to the fact that two of BISHOP PERCY's three Spenserian sonnets were printed as early as 1755 and 1756, and two of JOHN DUNCOMBE's as early as 1764 (one of them expresses the hope that his friend THOMAS EDWARDS will soon be "From sonnet's durance freed"); and Aubin, to other facts about the eighteenth-century sonnet, which was "firmly established" by 1789.

Even so, one can hardly maintain that the sonnet was a popular eighteenth-century literary type. Indeed JOHN HUGHES, editing Spenser in 1715 (I, cviii), calls it "a Species of Poetry so entirely disus'd, that it seems to be scarce known among us at this time." Sh.'s own sonnets were generally disesteemed by the few readers familiar with them. All his non-dramatic verse was omitted in the *Works* edited by ROWE, POPE, HANMER, THEOBALD, Warburton, Capell, Johnson, and others. In 1709 Rowe, who set the fashion, expressed no dislike of the sonnets, of the existence of which he was ignorant until his editorial task was practically at an end. He knew (I, ix f.) *Venus* but apparently not *Lucrece*, and he had tardily perused a copy of the 1640 *Poems* (p. xl): "There is a Book of Poems, publish'd in 1640, under the Name of Mr. William Shakespear, but as I have but very lately seen it, without an Opportunity of making any Judgment upon it, I won't pretend to determine, whether it be his or no."

¹ PETER MOTTEUX (*Gentleman's Journal*, January 1692, p. 20), describing the kingdom of poetry, puts in "the Archipelago of Bagatelles" the "Islands of Madrigals, Songs, Sonnets, Catches, &c. . . . [which] float up and down continually upon the water, being the lightest things in the world." Later (December, pp. 21 f.) he gives the text of a French sonnet with an English translation.

A good many eighteenth-century critics noticed the contradiction between the editors' title *Works* and the contents of their respective volumes. GEORGE CHALMERS (*Apology*, 1797, pp. 601 f.) vigorously condemns Rowe, who "engaged to publish *the works* of Shakspeare; yet, he only gave . . . the *dramas*. . . . Pope, Hanmer, and Warburton; all engaged to publish *the works* of Shakspeare, without performing what they undertook: And, they all seem to have thought very feebly of *truth*, and very contemptuously, of *the dull duty of an editor*." But the men concerned might have defended their practise on the ground that the four great folios of Sh. published in 1623, 1632, 1663, and 1685 had been limited to the dramas. With the idea, however, of making the title *Works* accurate and of vindicating the authenticity of the 1640 *Poems* CHARLES GILDON got out in 1710¹ and 1714 his so-called seventh and ninth volumes, containing "these less known Works of *Shakespear*" (1710, sig. A2^v), as a supplement to Rowe's editions. In his preliminary essay on the English stage (1710, pp. i f.) Gildon writes: "Tho' the Works of SHAKESPEAR have been lately publish'd without the Poems, . . . yet the Reader must not imagine, that the *Bookseller* of those, rejected these as spurious, or doubtful, or as unwilling to shelter under his Name, what was not genuine. . . . I have not only ventur'd to put them to the Press, for the Satisfaction of the Lovers of *Shakespear*, who have often, with Importunity, demanded them of me; but I doubt not to make it evident, that they are genuine, and more perfect in their Kind, than many, if not most, of his *Dramatic* Performances. I confess, that they are far from being all of an equal Excellence, but there is no more to be drawn from thence to their Disadvantage, than from the Inequality of his other Writings to the Prejudice of his Plays." In "Remarks On The Poems of *Shakespear*" he professes (p. 445) to have studied the playwright so assiduously that "I cou'd not easily be impos'd on by any spurious Copy of that Poet"—a profession nullified by the fact that, in reproducing the Benson text, he gives Sh. credit for verses by Thomas Heywood and others. "Tho' the Poems this Volume contains are extreamly distinguish'd in their Excellence, and Value, yet there is not one of them, that does not carry its Author's Mark, and Stamp upon it." To Gildon the sonnets were "epigrams,"² and (p. 446) "whoever knows any thing of *Shakespear* will find his Genius in every Epigram of these Poems," which (p. 447), "being most to his Mistress it is not at all unlikely, that she kept them by her till they fell into her Executors Hands or some Friend, who would not let them be any longer conceal'd." And (p. 450) "tho' Love and its Effects are often happily enough touch'd in many of these Poems, yet I must confess that it is but too visible, that *Petrarch* had a little infected his way of thinking on that Subject, yet who ever can admire Mr *Cowley*'s Mistress, has a thousand Times more Cause of Admiration of our *Shakespear* in his Love Verses." The epigrams (pp. 457 f.) are "perfect in their kind according to the best Rules that have been drawn from the Practice of the *An-*

¹ On this date (properly 1709) see I, xi n.

² JAMES HUTTON (*Greek Anthology in Italy*, 1935, pp. 56, 58 n.) notes that in the Renaissance "the equivalence of the sonnet and the ancient epigram is constantly asserted," and that "modern writers of Latin . . . generally translate *sonetto* by *epigramma*."

cients, by *Scaliger*" and others. Indeed (p. 463), "all things are the allow'd Subject of the Epigram; as long as they are treated of with Brevity [*sic*] Point, and Beauty. How far *Shakespeare* has excell'd in this Way is plain from his Poems before us; but this must be allow'd him, that much of the Beauty and Sweetness of Expression, which is so much contended for is lost by the Injury of Time and the great Change of our Language since his Time; and yet there is a wonderful Smoothness in many of them, that makes the Blood dance to its Numbers." Evidently Gildon realized that he had not exhausted the subject, and his final words (p. 464) on his own literary criticism are somewhat dejected: "I may hereafter be a little more accurate on this Head if ever there be any Prospect, that our great Men will grow weary of Trifles and *Gawds* . . . and have the Relish of Art and good Poetry, and good Sense." Returning to a discussion of the "epigram" in his *Complete Art of Poetry*, 1718 (I, 149), he reveals an underlying vein of abhorrence that characterized many of his successors: "For my Part, though I have no manner of Relish of it, I am yet for retaining it as a separate Body; that the Lovers of pert Turnis, quaint Thoughts, and Point may have some way of venting themselves, so as not to corrupt the other Parts of Poetry with it, to the prejudice of Nature, and all Poetic Excellence. *Petrarch* began this abominable *Manner*, and has been follow'd by Writers of most Nations, but most by our *English*."

In the next edition, LINTOTT's of 1711 (see pp. 36-38, above), the advertisement stresses only the notion of complete works and makes no curtsy to literary merits: "The Writings of Mr. *Shakespeare* are in so great Esteem, that several Gentlemen have subscrib'd to a late Edition [Rowe's] of his Dramatick Works in Six Volumes; which makes me hope, that this little Book will not be unacceptable to the Publick." Apparently Lintott's *Collection* sold slowly, for FORD (*Shakespeare*, 1935, p. viii) has observed that in R. OWEN's *Hypermnestra* it was advertised for sale at two shillings sixpence as late as 1722.

POPE knew very little about Sh.'s non-dramatic verse, which, like Rowe, he omitted from his 1723-1725 edition of the plays. He had at least looked at *Venus* and *Lucrece*, and he more or less accepted the 1640 *Poems* as genuine (I, x): "We have Translations from *Ovid* [really made by Heywood] published in his name, among those Poems which pass for his, and for some of which we have undoubted authority." One disappointed buyer of Pope's volumes, R. S., wrote to AARON HILL and WILLIAM BOND's *Plain Dealer* on May 3, 1725 (1730 ed., II, 483-492), objecting to Pope's elimination of *Venus*, *Lucrece*, "and numberless other Miscellaneous Pieces." But he did not otherwise refer to the sonnets, his lavish quotations and praise being directed almost exclusively at *Lucrece*.

By enthusiasts like R. S., probably GEORGE SEWELL's supplement, 1725, to Pope's Sh. was welcomed, but not for its editorial comments, which are valueless. While uttering slurs at Gildon, Sewell reprints his essays, accepts his proof that all the poems are (though they are not) authentic, and adapts his version of the 1640 text, which he falsely pretends to have made more correct. "The Style, Spirit, and Fancy," so typical of Sh., Sewell declares (Preface, p. ix), "are not to be mistaken by any tolerable Judge in these Matters" (even in verses that he did not write). The "Occasional" poems (that is, all those printed by Benson) "appear to be the first of his Works. A young Muse must

have a Mistress to play off the beginnings of Fancy, nothing being so apt to raise and elevate the Soul to a pitch of Poetry, as the Passion of Love." Sh., he thinks, was inspired "on reading our admirable *Spenser*." "In Metaphor, Allusion, Description, and all the strongest and highest Colourings of Poetry, they both are certainly without Equals."

Presumably the four Gildon-Sewell editions (1710-1728) had a fair sale, although MATTHEW CONCANEN (*Essay Against Too much Reading*, 1728, sigs. C2^v-C3) in praising the "immortal and inimitable *Shakespear*" who "has frighten'd three parts of the World from attempting to write" shows no knowledge of their contents. But on them LEWIS THEOBALD, who had not even heard of the 1609 quarto, based in 1732 a series of textual emendations that were printed in JOHN JORTIN's *Miscellaneous Observations upon Authors, Ancient and Modern* (II, 242-250). One of these tries to restore to its original purity the text of "his [that is, Sh.'s] *Tale of CEPHALUS and PROCRIS*"—poem XXV from the *P. P.* of 1612, a composition of Heywood's. None the less, LOUNSBURY (*Text of Sh.*, 1906, p. 419) rightly describes this article as "the first example of any critical attention paid to the poems as distinguished from the plays. Of the knowledge of the existence of the former many cultivated men of that day were innocent; of actual familiarity with them hardly any one could have been found guilty." In his 1733 edition of the so-called *Works*, where he showed (I, 261) further influence of Gildon and Sewell in crediting Sh. with the authorship of Marlowe's "Passionate Shepherd," THEOBALD made the important announcement (I, xlv): "As I have been importun'd, and am prepar'd, to give a correct Edition of our Author's POEMS, (in which many Terms occur that are not to be met with in his *Plays*,) I thought a *Glossary* to all *Shakespeare's Works* more proper to attend that Volume." The correspondence of Theobald and BISHOP WILLIAM WARBURTON during 1734 contains further references to this edition, which, according to LOUNSBURY (*Text of Sh.*, p. 557), was announced as ready for the press in the *Grub-Street Journal* of June 6, 1734. Over a year later, on October 18, 1735, THEOBALD assures Warburton (R. F. Jones, *Lewis Theobald*, 1919, p. 196), "My Design is by no means dropt, only deferr'd to Spring." But, for unknown reasons, it was permanently shelved—which was just as well for his reputation if he really intended, as seems certain, to edit the 1640 text.

RICHARD FARMER was the first scholar of note to examine the *P. P.* of 1612 and to understand its connection with the *Poems* of 1640. The latter, he pointed out in his important *Essay on the Learning of Sh.*, 1767 (pp. 33 f.), included nine verse translations by Heywood "which have been printed in the modern Editions of the *Poems of Shakespeare*." In turn, Farmer discussed Sh.'s canonical non-dramatic verse with EDWARD CAPELL, himself the first editor of the plays to reveal any real familiarity with it. In Sh.'s *Works*, 1767 (I, 10), Capell remarks that the dramatist's "other poetical works, that are known, will fill a volume the size of these that we have here," and at the end of his introduction (sig. 1F8^v) he lists the 1609 quarto of "*Shakespeare's Poems*" on the authority of Lintott's reprint, noting that he has never come across it. Before that time, none the less, he had elaborately revised a copy of Lintott for publication, though this Capell MS., as the CAMBRIDGE EDITORS designate it, was for some reason not sent to the press, but is preserved among

the books he bequeathed to Trinity College, Cambridge. The manuscript preface, dated 1766 (for which a note signed by FARMER claims, "I gave Mr Capell the Information of the opposite Page"), runs in part: "The fortune of SHAKESPEARE's Poems has been in some respects harder than that of his Plays: these had only errors to struggle with, and blemishes of their printers' creating; but the Poems are well-nigh sinking under a weight of such ribaldry, which Imposture has mix'd along with them, as were sufficient to work that effect upon any collected poems whatever. The things we are speaking of made their first appearance in publick while the Poet was yet living, but at different times. . . . The edition the '*Sonnets*' are printed from, must have been the first, if its title-page is to be credited; and yet we find them mention'd in authors some years before that, who must therefore be thought—either to have seen them in manuscript, or to speak of them only by report: they must, from the nature of them, have been compos'd at different periods; and either vanity, or some other motive, might have spread them abroad? . . . The merit of all these pieces should be judg'd of with an eye to the times they were writ in; and whoever shall so examine them, being first properly qualify'd by some acquaintance with other writers, will see abundantly more in them than a mere modern will be apt to admit of: *Surrey*, and the poets join'd with him, have left a number of things call'd—*Sonnets*, in a volume that bears the name of that nobleman; *Spencer*, who came a little while after, has given some that are better; and *Drayton*, who is the next in succession, a large assortment of them, among which are two or three that have merit: but even those will bear no comparison with many in this collection of *Shakespeare's*; which has this to recommend it throughout,—that a single thought, vary'd and put in language poetical, is the subject of each sonnet; a thing essential to these compositions, and yet but rarely observ'd by either ancient or modern dealers in them." In his *Notes and Various Readings*, 1779 (III, 263–268), CAPELL included about five pages of extracts from the sonnets.

Also in 1766 GEORGE STEEVENS reprinted Q in his *Twenty of the Plays of Shakespeare*, volume IV. His plan was to include all the plays that had been printed in quarto before 1616. Steevens's sole note (I, 16) on the sonnets is that they were published "in 1609, by G. ELD, one of the printers of his [Sh.'s] plays; which added to the consideration that they made their appearance with his name, and in his life-time, seems to be no slender proof of their authenticity." The *Monthly Review*, 1766 (XXXIV, 237 f.), commended this book except for "the old, exploded, barbarous and capricious modes of spelling and printing, which are here retained; and which . . . can only serve to offend the eye, and confuse the attention." It merely stated the fact that the sonnets were included.

THOMAS EWING, in the advertisement to his Dublin edition of the *Plays*, 1771, volume I, enumerates the merits of the work he is publishing. Among them, "the Poems, which are unquestionably Shakespear's, and which have very unreasonably been omitted in almost all the editions of his Works, are hereunto added."¹ Three years later FRANCIS GENTLEMAN included *Venus*,

¹ On Ewing see LA TOURETTE STOCKWELL, *Dublin Magazine*, July–September, 1929, pp. 29 f.

Lucrece, and "Poems on Various Occasions" in his edition of Sh. for J. Bell, following the text and order of the 1640, 1710, 1714, and later eighteenth-century editors. Admiration for Sh. played no part in his work. "The Swan of *Avon*, in our idea," he says frankly (sig. C5^v), "falls as far short of himself in his Poems, as he rises above others in his Plays." No compliment was here intended, for he continues (sig. C6^v): "If *Shakespeare's* merit, as a poet, a philosopher, or a man, was to be estimated from his Poems, though they possess many instances of powerful genius, he would, in every point of view, sink beneath himself, in these characters. Many of his subjects are trifling, his versification mostly laboured and quibbling, with too great a degree of licentiousness. After this last assertion it may be reasonably urged, why pieces, confessedly censurable, should be republished? To which challenge we have only to plead, that a desire of gratifying the admirers of our Author with an *entire* edition¹ of his works, has induced us to suffer some passages to remain, which we are ourselves as far from approving, as the most scrupulous of our Readers." The anonymous author of *Sonnets* (printed for R. Snagg, 1776, p. 2) must have agreed with Gentleman about the labor and quibbling such metrical composition entailed. His "Sonnet II. *On a SONNET*" begins:

"A Poetical friend bade me scribble a sonnet,
 "But if to compose it he'd give me a week,
 "I could no more do it than I could write greek,
 "So laborious it seems as I ponder upon it.

Thus I talk'd to my wife, who stood by in her bonnet. . . .

About this time GEORGE STEEVENS became the villain of the sonnets—a personage almost as much discussed as the friend, the rival poet, and the dark woman. In 1778, revising Johnson's Sh., he conformed to style by leaving out all the non-dramatic verse. Then to Edmond Malone's *Supplement* of 1780 he contributed a number of perverse and flippant notes (see, for example, I, 86) that have made him the laughing-stock of later commentators and critics. He found (p. 606) prevailing throughout the sequence "laboured perplexities of language" and "studied deformities of style," as well as (p. 685) "more conceit in any thirty-six of Shakspeare's *Sonnets*, than in the same number of his *Plays*." "A Sonnet was surely," he said (p. 682), in words reminiscent of Campion and Jonson, "the contrivance of some literary Procrustes. The single thought of which it is to consist, however luxuriant, must be cramped within fourteen verses, or, however scanty, must be spun out into the same number. On a chain of certain links the existence of this metrical whim depends; and its reception is secure as soon as the admirers of it have counted their expected and statutable proportion of rhimes. . . . Quaintness, obscurity, and tautology, are to be regarded as the constituent parts of this exotick species of composition. . . . I am one of those who should have wished it to have expired in the country where it was born." A sonnet (p. 684) is "composed in the highest strain of affectation, pedantry, circumlocution and nonsense"; it is "a species of composition which has reduced the most exalted poets to a level with the meanest rhimers; has almost cut down Milton and Shakspeare to the stand-

¹ [Some copies read "*entire* addition."]

ards of Pomfret . . . perhaps the lowest in the scale of English versifiers."

These are strong words, but it is noteworthy that they did not scandalize the admirable MALONE (ed. 1780, pp. 684 f.; see also I, 83), who plainly disclaimed any intention of defending the sonnets, and who in describing them employed tepid language. "However, as it appears to me that they have been somewhat under-rated, I think it incumbent on me to do them that justice to which they seem entitled." Steevens has blackened the picture. Their great defects are "a want of variety," a use of improper expressions addressed to a man, a fondness for "far-fetched conceits." The versification is "smooth and harmonious," "some of them are written with perspicuity and energy." The many beautiful lines will "strike every reader" who does not limit English poetry to heroic couplet and blank verse. The *Monthly Review*, 1780 (LXIII, 257), saw nothing out of the ordinary in the Steevens-Malone word-combat: "The Reader . . . must consult the Work itself. . . . We have reason to think that Mr. Steevens is disposed to adhere to his own opinion"—which the reviewer does not condemn. Much like Steevens's judgment was that of JOHN PINKERTON, who, in adversely criticizing the sonnet form, asserted (*Letters of Literature*, 1785, p. 52) that Sh. has, like Petrarch and Milton, "many false beauties."

SAMUEL AYS COUGH was of much the same mind. To his 1791 Dublin edition of the plays (published by William Jones) he added in volume II the poems and sonnets, the supplement being offered to subscribers for "the small advance of 3s. 3d." In a prefatory apology Ayscough unenthusiastically writes: "The sole aim of the Editor was, to have it in his power to accommodate the Admirers of Poetic excellence, with a complete and uniform Copy of *Shakspeare's entire Works*." JOHN ARMSTRONG (1771-1797) evidently had a more favorable opinion, for in 1791 he issued, under the pseudonym "Albert," a curious book, *Sonnets from Sh.*, made up of some forty selected passages from the plays paraphrased in sonnet form. "If any should regard this attempt," he explained (p. vi), "as intended to encumber the sentiments of Shakespeare with the frippery of a modern dress, or accommodate his language to the depravity of fashionable taste, let them remember, that the sonnet was a form of writing adopted by the great Bard himself." Armstrong's was "certainly an original idea," said the *Critical Review*, 1791 (new arrangement, II, 273), though how far "a happy one, will, we believe, admit of some debate." But the *Analytical Review*, 1791 (X, 284), could not "wholly suppress emotions of indignation, when we see the fairest forms of Shakespeare's fancy thus stiffened in the strait-lacing of rhyme—thus *procrustized* upon the bed of a sonnet." Probably ROBERT ANDERSON would have agreed with the reviewers, for in *The Works of the British Poets*, 1793 (II, 610), harking back to Malone's preface, he could find nothing better to say than that "the general stile of these poems leaves not the smallest doubt of their authenticity. . . . Many of them are not so simple and clear as they ought to be; yet some are written with perspicuity and energy: Their great defect is want of variety."

That Imp of the Perverse, STEEVENS, outdid himself in the preface (I, vii f.) to the *Plays* of 1793: "We have not reprinted the Sonnets, &c. of Shakspeare, because the strongest act of Parliament that could be framed, would fail to compel readers into their service; notwithstanding these miscellaneous Poems

have derived every possible advantage from the literature and judgement of their only intelligent editor, Mr. Malone [in 1780 and 1790], whose implements of criticism, like the ivory rake and golden spade in Prudentius, are on this occasion disgraced by the objects of their culture.—Had Shakspeare produced no other works than these, his name would have reached us with as little celebrity as time has conferred on that of Thomas Watson, an older and much more elegant sonneteer."¹ This passage has vicariously immortalized the crabbed critic and made him the butt of men greater as well as less in mental stature than he.² Many overlooked the significant "&c." and "miscellaneous Poems," with the result that often he has been spoken of as an enemy of the sonnets only, whereas his scorn was equally directed against *Venus*, *Lucrece*, the *L. C.*, the *P. P.*, and the *P. & T.*³

What irate defenders of Sh. too often forget is that Steevens was expressing, if in extremely bold and vigorous language, views held, so far as the sonnets are concerned, by most critics in his day and by many long after his death. Indeed FLEAY (*Biographical Chronicle*, 1891, II, 225 f.) thinks that "at first" Sh. himself was fond of the sonnet, "then he ceased to care for it; lastly [after 1598] he despised it"; LUCE (*Handbook*, 1906, p. 86) observes that Sh. "seldom mentions the sonnet without some accent of contempt"; and WILMON BREWER (*Sonnets and Sestinas*, 1937, pp. 144 f.) declares that Sh. "himself did not rate the sonnet high. In his dramas he spoke of it as suitable for shallow amours or idle displays of wit. He gave up writing sonnets as soon as the fashion changed." Contrary opinions are expressed by WENDELL (*William Sh.*, 1894, pp. 223 f.), who sees in such sonnets as 81 evidence that the whole sequence "must have seemed to the writer more important and valuable than his plays"; by HARDIN CRAIG (*Shakespeare*, 1931, p. 113), who believes that the non-dramatic verse was "more highly regarded by Shakespeare himself and by his contemporaries than were the plays, since plays were thought of as ephemeral if not mercenary"; and by many others. Whatever the truth of this matter, when STEEVENS defined a sonnet as a "metrical whim . . . composed in the highest strain of affectation, pedantry, circumlocution and nonsense," he had at his back the impressive authority of his lexicographer friend DR. JOHNSON. The latter abominated a number of literary types and metrical forms as such, especially sonnets, certain odes and pastorals, and blank verse. Even in the erudite pages of his *Dictionary*, 1755, he took occasion to say that the sonnet "is not very suitable to the English language, and has not been used by any man of eminence since *Milton*," and he jumped at the opportunity to gloss the

¹ ISAAC DISRAELI (*Curiosities of Literature*, 2d series, 1823, III, 46) says that Steevens thus risked "his own reputation as a poetical critic" out of malice, BOSWELL having told him that Steevens omitted all the poems from his 1793 edition "to spite . . . Malone, who had taken extraordinary pains in their elucidation."

² It may be noted that in *T. P.'s Weekly*, September 7, 1929, p. 569, NELLIE LORD, of Sydney, writes that the sonnets "were banned in New Zealand some years ago," but whether by an Act of Parliament or otherwise is not told.

³ GODWIN (ed. 1900, p. 29) even says: "Steevens, indeed, . . . reprinted the poems but excluded the sonnets, because, as he said, 'the strongest act. . .'"

word *sonnetteer* as "a small poet, [said] in contempt." Much later, in his life of Milton, 1779 (ed. C. H. Firth, 1907, p. 63), he pontificated, "The fabric of a sonnet, however adapted to the Italian language, has never succeeded in ours"; and in June, 1784, he listened approvingly while Mrs. Kennicot (*Boswell's Life of Johnson*, ed. G. B. Hill, 1891, IV, 352) related "a lively saying" he was supposed to have made to "Hannah More, who had expressed a wonder that the poet who had written *Paradise Lost* should write such poor Sonnets:— 'Milton, Madam, was a genius that could cut a Colossus from a rock; but could not carve heads upon cherry-stones.'" Evidently this famous pronouncement did reflect his sentiments, though what he actually said to Miss More (the same, IV, 115 n.; A. M. B. Meakin, *Hannah More*, 1911, pp. 146 f.) was directed, not at the sonnets, but at *L'Allegro*, *Il Penseroso*, and *Lycidas*: "He was a Phidias that could cut a Colossus out of a rock, but could not cut heads out of cherry-stones."

HAVENS and MITCHELL have proved (see p. 331, above) that sonnets (however irregular in form) were fairly well known from 1660 to 1800; but the facts remain that Johnson and Steevens were typical in their distaste, and that for decades this distaste continued. In 1784 the *Monthly Review* (LXXI, 368) declared: "The English language can boast of few good Sonnets. They are in general harsh, formal, and uncouth: faults entirely owing to the pedantic and childish affectation of interchanging the rhymes, after the manner of the Italians." "The stated form and measure" of the sonnet, JOHN PINKERTON (*Letters of Literature*, 1785, p. 51) wrote, are "so disgustingly similar, that I believe no man of genius would now write twenty in a life time."

In an age when irregular sonnets were admired, the rigidity of the Petrarchan and Shakespearean rime schemes, which made their users seem to be writing in handcuffs, aroused hostility. That the commonplace and irregular sonnets¹ of CHARLOTTE SMITH were generally regarded as superior to Sh.'s need cause no surprise. "A very trifling compliment is paid to Mrs. Smith," said the *G. M.*, 1786 (LVI, 334), "when it is observed how much her Sonnets exceed those of *Shakspeare* and *Milton*. She has undoubtedly conferred honour on a species of poetry which most of her predecessors in this country have disgraced." "It was reserved for" Mrs. Smith "and one other [unnamed] author," according to the *Critical Review*, 1788 (LXV, 531), "to show, that a species of poetry [the sonnet], the most artificial, might be rendered natural and pleasing in our language, by taste and judgment. Even fetters may be made to hang with grace, and add to beauty." "The sonnet," H. WHITE (*G. M.*, 1786, LVI, 1110) asserted, "is of a particular and *arbitrary* construction; it partakes of the nature of blank verse, by the lines running into each other at proper intervals. . . . The sonnet is certainly the most difficult species of all poetic composition; but difficulty well subdued is excellence." He praises Milton's, does not mention Sh.'s.

A writer in the *Monthly Review*, 1789 (LXXXI, 81), frankly admits: "Son-

¹ FLORENCE M. A. HILBISH, whose *Charlotte Smith*, 1941, reached me too late to be cited in this discussion, says (pp. 246 f.) that of Mrs. Smith's sonnets forty-four are Shakespearean, one Spenserian, one Petrarchan, forty-six irregular.

nets are a species of poetry, to which, in the English dress, we confess ourselves not extremely partial." Even Milton's "were inferior to his other writings." "Indeed," says another contributor (p. 366), "to be confined within the limits of fourteen lines; . . . and those lines cramped by an ill-contrived recurrence of rhimes; is a situation not to be voluntarily sought by poets." "Almost every species of composition," declares the *New London Magazine*, 1789 (V, 212), can be written "with distinguished *eclat*" in English "except the Sonnet, which in despite of every attempt appears in a state of almost rusticated barbarism, or refined absurdity, owing, it must be so, to the want of judgment, taste, or cultivation in its writers; and perhaps all these three causes, operate to produce these very dull and disgusting effects, in this line of exotic painting, in studious turn of phrase and abstract conceits, so totally repugnant to true poetry, and its genuine principles of harmony." "Milton," the *Monthly Review*, 1797 (XXIV, 17), announces in words that would have disgraced Macaulay's schoolboy, "was, we believe, the first Englishman that was induced to attempt the sonnet in the language of our island: but critics are not agreed as to the success which crowned our great poet's attempt in this new kind of poetry," and the *Critical Review*, 1805 (3d series, VI, 37), echoes that Milton's sonnets "were the first introduction of this species of composition into the English language." The scholarly J. C. WALKER, in a letter of March 7, 1797, to Bishop Percy (J. B. Nichols, *Illustrations*, 1848, VII, 731), complains of "the painful restriction of the *sonnet*." The *Annual Review*, 1803 (II, 564), maintains that sonnets "at best are but stiff difficult trifles, and surely more remote from the simplicity which they often affect than any other class of poems in our language." As for those in GEORGE HENDERSON's anthology *Petrarca*, 1803, "the majority . . . are little better than ravings . . . aped by hysterical affectation, or drivelling incoherencies, lisped by sentiment in her dotage, than which nothing can be conceived more hostile to genuine poetry."¹ The opinion of the *Edinburgh Review*, 1805 (VI, 297), is that the sonnet, "brought to perfection by the Italians," in England "has never been completely naturalized. Milton and Gray [!] . . . have cultivated it with most success."

So unceasing was critical abuse that in 1807 CAPELL LOFFT, in "La Corona" (*Laura*, 1814, V, sig. 3C4), wrote a poetic defense:

GRACE the celestial LYRE in Characters divine,
 Long injur'd SONNET! whom the Crowd arraigns;
 And as a mere frivolity disdains,
 An empty toy of many a tinkling line;
 Incapable of Great and High Design. . . .
 What Science, Virtue, Piety, revere,
 Have dwelt within the SONNET's little Frame.

Almost simultaneously (1806) WORDSWORTH was writing that

In sundry moods, 't was pastime to be bound
 Within the Sonnet's scanty plot of ground,

¹ HENDERSON himself said of the sonnet (pp. xxiv f.), during "the AUGUSTAN era of English literature, it is believed, that scarcely an instance of this kind of poetry appeared."

and expressing the hope that "some Souls (for such there needs must be)" would "find brief solace there, as I have found." But Wordsworth, as will be seen, blew hot and cold on this subject. Meanwhile, SIR EGERTON BRYDGES had been "solaced," during his undergraduate days at Cambridge, by Milton's sonnets, which, in spite of "the impotent attempt of Johnson to decry them," led him to write and publish forty-four of his own in 1785. But they were powerless to disarm criticism, and in his fourth edition (*Poems*, 1807, p. 213) he confesses, "It has been the fashion of late to despise Sonnets, more especially those, which . . . are called legitimate."

With contemporary versifiers in mind the *Quarterly*, 1809 (II, 281 f.), spoke of the sonnet as "a species of poem which we are by no means disposed to place so high in the scale of merit, as its popularity appears to warrant. The dilation of a single idea into fourteen lines accords but ill with the energy of the English language," and English is not suited for "the monotony of metre, and the perpetual recurrence of the same rhyme." But "attracted by its brevity and supposed facility, and probably not a little dazzled by the meretricious ornament of which it has been found to be susceptible, every rhyming schoolboy and love-sick girl now give their crude effusions to the public under the denomination of sonnets. . . . In all probability the evil will progressively increase until it become a real disgrace to British literature." But, the writer conceded, sonnets *per se* are not "totally devoid of merit," and those written by BOWLES "are superior to any we have read."

The slurs of real poets are more significant than those of magazine essayists. BYRON disliked the sonnet, apparently because of its artificiality and insincerity. On December 17, 18, 1813, he noted (*Letters and Journals*, ed. R. E. Prothero, 1922, II, 379) that he had composed "two Sonnets on ***. I never wrote but one sonnet before, and that was not in earnest, and many years ago, as an exercise—and I will never write another. They are the most puling, petrifying, stupidly platonic compositions. I detest the Petrarch so much, that I would not be the man even to have obtained his Laura, which the metaphysical, whining dotard never could."

The disapproval of WORDSWORTH was, curiously enough, just as vigorous—for a time. On April 20, 1822, he wrote (*Letters . . . The Later Years*, ed. E. de Sélincourt, 1939, I, 70 f.) to his quondam adversary, W. S. LANDOR, referring to the latter's slur at the sonnet in 1806 (see p. 345, below): "You . . . depreciate that form of composition. I do not wonder at this; I used to think it egregiously absurd, though the greatest poets since the revival of literature have written in it." He appends the illuminating and not altogether flattering statement that since he began in 1802, "from want of resolution to take up anything of length, I have filled up many a moment in writing Sonnets, which, if I had never fallen into the practice, might easily have been better employed." This confession left Landor cold, and the English sonnet continued to be of little value in his eyes. WORDSWORTH himself (the same, II, 587), discussing in 1831 the metrical structure, not the content, of sonnets, said that Sh.'s, unlike those of Milton, "are merely quatrains with a couplet tacked to the end; and if they depended much upon the versification they would unavoidably be heavy." Before that date, however, he had written and published "Scorn not the Sonnet," 1827, pointing out to unsympathetic critics "mindless of its

just honours" that it had been a favorite of Dante, Petrarch, Camoens, Tasso, Sh., and Milton, and using the famous words, "with this key Shakspeare unlocked his heart."

Ordinarily WORDSWORTH's sonnets were ineffective in producing the results called for: they failed to stop the construction of railways, the passage of the Reform Bill, the use of pictures in newspapers and magazines; they were ineffectual in bringing a sense of guilt to the coupon-defaulting Pennsylvanians. But with "Scorn not the Sonnet" he had better luck than usual. Of course he did not convert everybody. One E. C. in 1832 (*G. M.*, CII, ii, 216) spoke patronizingly of "the flights and fancies" which are necessary to the sonnet "because the subject not being of the sublimest kind, may receive some advantage from the *elegancy of its style* and the variety of its *images*." Yet by the 1830's Wordsworth's own praises were beginning to be hymned even in the periodicals which once had damned him. His success as a sonneteer was acknowledged by almost everybody. Said the *Quarterly*, 1834 (LII, 351), "There never was a poet who reached so near to perfection" in "discrimination in thought and aptitude in language" as Wordsworth in his sonnets. Reviewing *Yarrow Revisited* in 1835, *Blackwood's* (XXXVII, 720) generalizes: "It is allowed on all hands now that there are no sonnets in any language comparable with Wordsworth's. Even Milton must yield the palm"—while Petrarch and Sh. were left to console themselves as best they could. But in the next volume of the same magazine, 1835 (XXXVIII, 587), another contributor remarks: "A man may stand upon Westminster Bridge from morning till night, with a box full of real golden sovereigns exposed for sale, at a penny a-piece, and not sell ten the whole day; and these few will be bought as counters. . . . There has been a time, and not very long since, that we should have looked upon an author venturous enough to publish a volume of sonnets, in the same light with the experimentalist on the sovereigns; and we are not quite sure that, however good the commodity, the sale would yet be large." "Many people," D. L. RICHARDSON asserts (*G. M.*, 1835, n. s., IV, 253), "disapprove entirely of the system of the sonnet as too arbitrary and confined, and compare it to the bed of Procrustes."

Unabashed by such comments, in 1835 R. F. HOUSMAN compiled an anthology of sonnets, wherein he claimed (*Collection*, p. v) that the work of Wordsworth has "done much towards diminishing the inveterate prejudice that once existed in this country against the Sonnet," although Dr. Johnson's dictum of its incompatibility with the English language "still continues to influence no inconsiderable portion of what is termed 'the reading public.'" But (p. xvi) "how was it possible that he who could not feel the melody of Lycidas, should appreciate the lofty and solemn-sounding music, the 'long drawn out' and 'link'd sweetness' of the Sonnet?" J. W. CROKER, however, had other notions. "We are," he confessed (*Quarterly*, 1837, LIX, 209), "no great admirers of the sonnet at its best—concurring in Dr. Johnson's opinion that it does not suit the genius of our language. . . . It seems to be, even in master hands, that species of composition which is at once the most artificial and the least effective, which bears the appearance of the greatest labour and produces the least pleasure. . . . When a would-be poet has collected in his memory a few of what may have struck him as poetical ideas, he puts them into his machine,

and after fourteen turns, out comes a sonnet." Perhaps ignorant of Croker's tirade and certainly inspired by Housman, EBENEZER ELLIOTT penned the sonnets, "(if sonnets they are,)" in his *Rhymed Rambles*. In the second of them (*Poetical Works*, 1840, p. 173) he ranks with Milton and Wordsworth Housman's pseudonymous Ismael Fitzadam, whose "mournful music shews That the scorn'd sonnet's charm may yet endear Some long deep strain, or lay of well-told woes." EDWARD FITZGERALD might have retorted that Wordsworth's lyrics had only increased "the inveterate prejudice" and the "scorn." To Frederick Tennyson he wrote on July 26, 1841 (*Letters*, 1894, I, 87 f.): "I certainly don't like sonnets, as you know. . . . What do they seem fit for but to serve as little shapes in which a man may mould very mechanically any single thought which comes into his head, which thought is not lyrical enough in itself to exhale in a more lyrical measure? The difficulty of the sonnet metre in English is a good excuse for the dull didactic thoughts which naturally incline towards it: fellows know there is no danger of decanting their muddy stuff ever so slowly: they are neither prose nor poetry." Five years later old SAMUEL ROGERS (E. J. Morley, *Henry Crabb Robinson*, 1938, II, 658) was still lambasting the sonnet as a form. Such attacks have recurred sporadically from that time almost to the present day, as when C. E. TURNER (*Our Great Writers*, 1864, I, 155) informed his Russian students in St. Petersburg that Sh.'s lyrics are inferior compositions, and that the sonnet-form is "ill-suited to the genius of our language, however admirable it may be in Italian," and when ARCHBISHOP R. C. TRENCH in 1866 (*Sonnets of . . . Wordsworth*, 1884, p. vii) noted his awareness that the sonnet was not, even among "lovers of poetry, a popular form of composition; that there exist many prejudices against it." CHARLES RUSSELL (*Dublin Review*, 1876, LXXIX, 400; see also *N. & Q.*, March 23, 1940, p. 212) declared: "The Sonnet never [*sic*] has been a popular form of poetry, and it is too complex and artificial in its structure ever to suit the taste of the multitude." MARK PATTISON (*Sonnets of John Milton*, 1883, pp. 34 f.) expressed a common notion in saying that "the so-called sonnets of Shakspeare are not sonnets at all . . . but a continuous poem, or poems, written in fourteen-line stanzas,"¹ and MATTHEW RUSSELL (*Irish Monthly*, 1886, XIV, 335) characterized the sonnet as "a species of poetical composition which is distasteful even to many who have a fair relish for poetry." As late as 1898, the *Athenaeum* (April 30, p. 562) assured its readers that "the sonnet . . . is not of native growth, and has never become naturalized"; and still later the *Academy*, 1903 (LXIV, 180 f.), announced: "Throughout the greater portion of her career, indeed (until, that is, the Victorian period), the English muse has not taken kindly to the sonnet. . . . Surely . . . the sonnet is ill-suited to English genius." The writer then expresses his preference for the "simpler form" of Sh. rather than the "complexly artificial" Italian form.

But to return from this lengthy digression. Many of STEEVENS's immediate successors heartily sympathized with his condemnation of Sh.'s poems. A

¹ Pattison's dogma is disputed by VERITY (*Milton's Sonnets*, 1895, pp. xxv f.), BEECHING (ed. 1904, pp. xlviii-l), E. H. C. OLIPHANT (*P. Q.*, 1932, XI, 137), H. BELLOC (*Milton*, 1935, pp. 212 f.), and others. LUCE (*Handbook*, 1906, pp. 83 f.) condemns the Shakespearean form in much the vein of Pattison.

critic in the *Monthly Review*, 1794 (XIII, 267), quoted the supposedly offensive passage from the 1793 Sh. and concluded: "We agree with Mr. Steevens in this condemnation of Shakspeare's poems; which . . . are in general very paltry. . . . Now and then . . . , though very rarely, some good passages occur in the sonnets"—but "the sonnets" are illustrated by a quotation from a song in the *P. P.* But other writers, disregarding the widespread current antipathy towards sonnets, with the most monotonous, because anticipated, reiteration damned him for his depraved taste. Few iconoclasts have won such long-continued publicity and execration—and few of his critics (Dyce, for example) have had the malicious humor of this "Puck of commentators," whose ghost surely must be pleased at the commotion.

The poems and sonnets, with no editorial observations, were incorporated in the London edition of 1797 as well as its reissues (with new title-pages) in 1804 (?) and 1806. C. COOKE's issue of 1797, on the other hand, does have an introduction, which, like dozens of its successors, adds nothing not previously uttered, and which especially echoes (p. 14) ANDERSON (*Works of the British Poets*, 1793; see p. 337, above): "Many of them [the sonnets] are written with perspicuity and energy; some are less forcible and expressive, and most of them want the charm of variety to recommend them."

ANNA SEWARD, the now-bedraggled Swan of Lichfield, in 1798 (*Letters*, 1811, V, 159) gave her weighty judgment that "the detached poems of our immortal Shakespeare, are strongly tingured" with "stiff infelicity of expression," "quaintness," "quibbling," an "utter want of harmonious flow in the numbers." GEORGE CHALMERS (*Supplemental Apology*, 1799, pp. 82 f.) thought Sh. inferior to Spenser as a sonneteer in some respects, but superior in the "great quality of a true poet," imagination. A writer in the *Monthly Review*, 1800 (XXXI, 189 f.), was impressed by the obscurities in the sonnets; but, after all, "few persons of good taste will regret those obscurities, in poems so greatly inferior to the other productions of Shakspeare; and for which his name alone can now procure a single reader." Evidently STEEVENS was not unique in thinking an Act of Parliament powerless to rescue the reputation of our sonneteer.

The sonnets of Sh., and to a less extent of Milton, were temporarily eclipsed by those of more modern bards, like J. C. BAMPFYLDE (1754-1796), W. L. BOWLES (1762-1850), THOMAS EDWARDS (1699-1757), WILLIAM PRESTON (1753-1807), MARY ROBINSON, or "Perdita" (1758-1800), THOMAS RUSSELL (1762-1788), CHARLOTTE SMITH (1749-1806), and THOMAS WARTON (1728-1790). J. T. (*Universal Magazine*, 1792, volume XCI)¹ announces (pp. 408 f.) that the sonnets of Mrs. Smith "display a more touching melancholy, a more poetical simplicity, nay . . . a greater vigour and correctness of genius, than any other English poems that I have ever seen, under the same denomination: and I certainly do not mean to except the sonnets of Milton." Indeed (p. 414) "over the epic field, Milton, of all English bards, triumphs without a rival, Shakspeare in the dramatic, and in the sonnet, Charlotte Smith." That lady's sonnets, according to the *Critical Review*, 1802 (new arrangement, XXXIV, 393), "are assuredly the most popular in the language, and deservedly so," and many other judges concurred. SIR WALTER SCOTT (*Miscellaneous Prose*

¹ His article is a reply to that of H. WHITE (see p. 339, above).

Works, 1827, IV, 49 f.) had no sympathy with "the pedantic objection" sometimes urged against irregular sonnets. Indeed Mrs. Smith's "more simple model" seemed to him "equally or better fitted for the theme . . . than would have been the complicated and involved form of the regular Italian sonnet." Even WORDSWORTH (*Prose Works*, ed. Grosart, 1876, III, 151) praises Mrs. Smith as "a lady to whom English verse is under greater obligations than are likely to be either acknowledged or remembered." "There are no better sonnets in the English language than Russell's," RICHARD MANT (editing Thomas Warton's *Poetical Works*, II, 23 n.) declared in 1802. SOUTHEY is said (D. M. Main, *Treasury*, 1880, p. 363) to have considered Russell "the best English sonnet-writer," and WORDSWORTH (see E. J. Morley, *Henry Crabb Robinson*, 1938, I, 293) thought highly of him. LANDOR, in spite of his antipathy to sonnets, in the preface to *Simonidea*, 1806 (pp. vi f.), praises "a poem on Philoctetes, by a Mr. Russel, which would authorise him to join the shades of Sophocles and Euripides. I have mentioned it to several learned men: few had ever heard of him, and but two had read his sonnet. Alas, it is a sonnet! In spite of a structure of verse, incompatible with the excursive genius of our commanding language, it is perhaps, the most classical poem that modern Europe has produced."

Nor was COLERIDGE immune to such feelings. As everybody knows, in the *Biographia Literaria*, 1817 (I, 13-25), he tells how, as a boy of seventeen, he was fascinated at discovering the sonnets of "the exquisite Bowles." "I had just entered on my seventeenth year, when the sonnets of Mr. Bowles, twenty in number, and just then published in a quarto pamphlet, were first made known . . . to me. . . . My earliest acquaintances will not have forgotten the undisciplined eagerness and impetuous zeal, with which I laboured to make prose-lytes, not only of my companions, but of all with whom I conversed, of whatever rank, and in whatever place. As my school finances did not permit me to purchase copies, I made, within less than a year and an half, more than forty transcriptions, as the best presents I could offer to those, who had in any way won my regard. And with almost equal delight did I receive the three or four following publications of the same author. . . . My obligations to Mr. Bowles were indeed important, and for radical good." He says the sonnets withdrew him from "metaphysicks, and . . . theological controversy," and taught him that there was a kind of poetry better than that of Pope and his followers, a kind like Bowles's that "combined natural thoughts with natural diction," that "reconciled the heart with the head." It is scarcely to the point that J. G. LOCKHART (*Blackwood's*, 1817, II, 10) denounced this passage—"There must be some grievous natural defect in that mind which, even at the age of seventeen, could act so insanely; and . . . no real and healthy sensibility could have exaggerated to itself so grossly the merits of Bowles' Sonnets. They are undoubtedly most beautiful, . . . but they neither did nor could produce any such effects as are here described, except upon a mind singularly weak and helpless"—or that WILLIAM HAZLITT (*Edinburgh Review*, 1817, XXVIII, 491) assailed Coleridge for overrating Bowles's sonnets, "which he prefers to Warton's, which last we, in our turn, prefer to Wordsworth's, and indeed to any Sonnets in the language."

The delight with which Coleridge's friends, LAMB, SOUTHEY, and WORDS-

WORTH, read the lyrics of the love-lorn Wiltshire parson almost equaled his own. As late as 1836 (E. J. Morley, *Henry Crabb Robinson*, 1938, II, 480) WORDSWORTH was professing admiration for them, and CRABB ROBINSON, who (the same, I, 140) had thought them "mawkish and unreadable" in 1814, found a number beautiful. In the collected edition of his poems, 1838 (I, ix), SOUTHEY took pains to acknowledge "having derived much benefit at one time from Cowper, and more from Bowles; for which, and for the delight which his poems gave me at an age when we are most susceptible of such delight," he expressed his gratitude. But the young COLERIDGE was exuberant in his praise. To Mary Evans he wrote in February, 1792 (*Letters*, ed. E. H. Coleridge, 1895, I, 37), of "some delicious poetry . . . by the exquisite Bowles." "Bowles (the bard of my idolatry)," he told John Thelwall in 1796 (the same, I, 179, 196), is "the most tender, and, with the exception of Burns, the only *always natural* in our language," although it is true that only two years before, September, 1794 (the same, I, 82), he had assured his fellow Pantisocrat Southey, "I like your sonnets exceedingly—the best of any I have yet seen."

In the introduction to a group of sonnets in his *Poems* of 1797 (pp. 71-74) COLERIDGE gave a strange account of the sonnet and its laws, and by implication was about as severe on Milton and Sh. as STEEVENS had been: "Charlotte Smith and Bowles are they who first made the Sonnet popular among the present English: I am justified therefore . . . in deducing its laws from *their* compositions. The Sonnet then is a small poem, in which some lonely feeling is developed. . . . It is confined to fourteen lines, because as some particular number is necessary, and that particular number must be a small one, it may as well be fourteen as any other number. When no reason can be adduced against a thing, Custom is a sufficient reason for it. . . . Poems, in which no lonely feeling is developed, are not Sonnets because the Author has chosen to write them in fourteen lines: they should rather be entitled Odes, or Songs, or Inscriptions. . . . Respecting the metre of a Sonnet, the Writer should consult his own convenience.—Rhymes, many or few, or no rhymes at all—whatever the chastity of his ear may prefer, whatever the rapid expression of his feelings will permit;—all these things are left at his own disposal." It is, he continues, difficult to be sincere, to express real passion in a sonnet written in the Italian scheme: "I should sooner expect to write pathetic *Axes* or *pour forth extempore Eggs and Altars!* But the best confutation of such idle rules is to be found in the Sonnets of those who have observed them, in their inverted sentences, their quaint phrases, and incongruous mixture of obsolete and spenserian words: and when, at last, the thing is toiled and hammered into fit shape, it is in general racked and tortured Prose rather than any thing resembling Poetry." Coleridge says (p. 72) that Bowles's have a "marked superiority over all other Sonnets," "they domesticate with the heart, and become, as it were, a part of our identity." He admits (p. 74) that "the Sonnet has been ever a favorite species of composition with me; but I am conscious that I have not succeeded in it." Years later R. F. HOUSMAN (*Collection*, 1835, p. xxvi) thought it necessary to attack these youthful remarks. Coleridge "exhibited an entire misconception of . . . [its] nature. . . . The Sonnet was never designed to be what . . . [he] pronounced it." The rules (pp. xxx f.) are important and rigid, though of course adherence to them "is not the *only* test and criterion of a

Sonnet." But the poet had recanted a few years before his death. "What is an English Sonnet?" he asks in *Blackwood's*, 1832 (XXXI, 956), and answers sarcastically: "Down with Theory—Facts, facts, facts must decide. And some myriad of these, with deliberate rhymes, if not metre or reason, perpetrated *facts*, have established that a copy of verses, consisting of exactly fourteen lines, is an English Sonnet . . . rhymes being the ordinary, but not necessary accompaniment." He prints an extract from his poem "Youth and Age," very irregular in meter and rime, as "The Old Man's Sigh. A Sonnet"—because it has fourteen lines.

While the sonnets of minor contemporary poets were being treated with exaggerated deference, Sh.'s were usually condemned or ignored. To be sure, HAVENS (*Influence of Milton*, 1922, p. 523) shows the growth of Shakespearean sonnets in England from zero in 1740–1760 to twenty-seven in 1760–1780, one hundred fifty-four in 1780–1790, two hundred seventy in 1790–1800. But (p. 524) this growth "was not due to the influence of Shakespeare, for his quatorzains were not admired at the time nor was their rime-scheme known by his name or justified by his practice. This particular structure seems, in fact, to have had no advocates and not to have been distinguished, by those who discussed the subject, from the irregular forms." The anthologist GEORGE HENDERSON, in *Petrarca*, 1803 (pp. vii f., xxi f.), confesses that his Elizabethan examples were included not for their intrinsic merits, since few "could be found agreeable to modern taste," but "to illustrate the progressive refinement of which this species of versification . . . appears to have been susceptible." "Until the time of DRUMMOND . . . we can advance slender claim to any degree of elegance in this species of versification. . . . In too many instances . . . our early Sonnets abound with sentiments so hyperbolically uttered, and resemblances so extravagantly and uncouthly drawn, as must necessarily render them disgusting to any but a rude or uncultivated taste." In its notice of this volume the *Annual Review*, 1803 (II, 564), took an attitude as uncompromising as that of Johnson or STEEVENS.¹

WORDSWORTH's own great sonnet period began in 1802: he had been interested by Bowles, but it was his sister Dorothy's reading of Milton that made him "take fire." In the light of his later tirade against STEEVENS, it is edifying to find that before 1803 he jotted down in volume II of a copy of Anderson's *Works of the British Poets* (now in the Folger Sh. Library) the following devastating note (Raysor, *Coleridge's Miscellaneous Criticism*, 1936, p. 454): "These sonnets beginning at CXXVII to his mistress, are worse than a puzzle-peg. They are abominably harsh, obscure, and worthless. The others are for the most part much better, have many fine lines very fine lines and passages. They are also in many places warm with passion. Their chief faults—and heavy ones they are—are sameness, tediousness, quaintness, and elaborate obscurity." Wordsworth was writing at a time when he himself had not entirely learned to "scorn not the sonnet." His annotation came to the attention of COLERIDGE, who on November 2, 1803, wrote in the same volume a note (Raysor, p. 455) for his seven-year-old son: "These sonnets thou, I trust, if God preserve thy life, Hartley! thou wilt read with a deep interest. . . . To

¹ See p. 340, above.

thee, I trust, they will help to explain the mind of Shakespeare. . . . O my son! I pray fervently that thou may'st know inwardly how impossible it was for a Shakespeare not to have been in his heart's heart chaste. I see no elaborate obscurity and very little quaintness—nor do I know any sonnets that will bear such frequent reperusal: so rich in metre, so full of thought and *exquisite* diction."

The great are privileged to change their minds. Less instructive, but not unamusing, are the contradictions of smaller men. NATHAN DRAKE, who a few years later was to recant his own blasphemies and to speak bitterly of the dead critic STEEVENS, in the *Literary Hours* of 1804 (I, 107 f.)¹ practically reproduces the latter's disdainful words of 1793: "Our romantic Spenser . . . has endeavoured to transfuse the ease and amenity of the Petrarchian . . . [sonnet]. It is scarcely necessary to say that he has completely failed. In his long series of sonnets, the critic will . . . find little to recompense the trouble of research. . . . [Yet Spenser's are] far superior to the attempts of the mighty Father of the English Drama. The sonnets of Shakspeare are buried beneath a load of obscurity and quaintness; nor does there issue a single ray of light to quicken, or to warm the heavy mass. Mr. Malone has once more given them to the press: but his last Editor has, I think, acted with greater judgment, in forbearing to obtrude such crude efforts upon the public eye: for where is the utility of propagating compositions which no one can endure to read?" Indeed (p. 112), "the first among the poets of Great Britain who attained to *excellence* in the formation of the sonnet was *Drummond* of Hawthornden."

Editing Sh.'s poems in 1804, W. C. OULTON reprinted Cooke's introduction (1797) and added a melange of Gentleman and Malone. Many of the sonnets, he thinks (I, xii f.), "are written with perspicuity and energy; some are less forcible and expressive, and most of them want the charm of variety to recommend them." But "as the style and manner of writing has been progressively improving during the long series of time which has elapsed from the days of Shakespeare to the present period, it would be highly illiberal and disingenuous to place his poems in a comparative view with the polished and refined productions of more modern bards." Oulton was disturbed by the morality—or immorality—of the sonnets Sh. addressed to a male friend, and hence he takes occasion (II, 217) to object to Malone's textual alteration at 98.11 that would be "agreeable" if the person there addressed were "a *female*," but that, since a man is the subject, "might render these poems still more disgusting to a modern critic." Perhaps other editors felt similar qualms,² even though B. H. MALKIN (*A Father's Memoirs*, 1806, p. xxxiv) reassuringly declared, "Shakspeare's Venus and Adonis, Tarquin and Lucrece, and his Sonnets . . . [are] now little read." In the same year CHARLES SYMMONS (*Life of John Milton*, p. 225), like others before and after him, placed Sh. as a sonneteer below Drummond. PERCIVAL STOCKDALE, in *Lectures on the Truly Eminent English Poets*, 1807 (I, 99), dismisses all the poems, in one brief paragraph, as "altogether

¹ I have not seen the second edition (1800). The passage is not in the first (1798).

² "What a heap of wretched Infidel Stuff" was the comment jotted down at the end of 154 by an early owner of the Rosenbach copy of Q.

unworthy of the authour." A disciple of STEEVENS, he observes that "the tedious, and embarrassing measure of the sonnet, is strenuously defended by Mr. Malone; from his unqualified veneration of Shakespeare; who seems to be as infallible an oracle to *him*, as Dr. Johnson was to Mr. Boswell." With Stockdale the *Edinburgh Review*, 1808 (XII, 65), found itself in harmony, since "all the praise that can be given" to the sonnets and poems "is, that they are bad resemblances of the heaviest passages of Spencer."

Compiling *The Works of the English Poets* in 1810 (V, 15), ALEXANDER CHALMERS announced that Sh.'s poems, "have never been favourites with the public, and have seldom been reprinted with his plays." He then quoted "the peremptory decision of Mr. Steevens, on the merits of these poems," and decided: "Severe as this may appear, it only amounts to the general conclusion which modern critics have formed. Still it cannot be denied that there are many scattered beauties among his Sonnets, and in *The Rape of Lucrece*; enough, it is hoped, to justify their admission into the present collection." Likewise in 1811 SIR EGERTON BRYDGES (*British Bibliographer*, 1814, IV, 2, 16) objected to STEEVENS's claim that Watson was "a more elegant sonneteer" than Sh., but his praise is not whole-hearted: "It is true that Shakspeare's sonnets are not among the best of his minor poems; but they exhibit some occasional traits of his genius; and, I think, more genuine poetical talent" than Watson's.

On November 28, 1811, CRABB ROBINSON attended Coleridge's fourth Sh. lecture, the repetitiousness of which gave him much concern. COLERIDGE, he says (E. J. Morley, *Henry Crabb Robinson*, 1938, I, 52 f.), "made some striking observations" on *Venus*, "had nothing to say" about *Lucrece*, and "then classified the dramas." "He certainly might, with a little exertion, have collected matter enough for *one* lecture at least out of the poems of Shakespeare. But he utterly passed over the *Sonnets*, and made no remark on the reception the poems have met with from modern critics."¹ In later discourses on Sh., even when dealing with *Venus* and *Lucrece*, Coleridge paid almost no attention to the sonnets. But in a lecture on Donne (1818) he assured his hearers (Raysor, *Coleridge's Miscellaneous Criticism*, 1936, pp. 137 f.) that Sh. "is never *positively* bad, even in his Sonnets. He may be sometimes worthless (N. B., I don't say he *is*), but nowhere is he *unworthy*." About a year before his death, in May, 1833, COLERIDGE (*Table Talk*, ed. H. N. Coleridge, 1835, II, 181) expressed himself with some of the fervor he had manifested in 1803, describing the sonnets as characterized, like *Venus* and *Lucrece*, "by boundless fertility and laboured condensation of thought, with perfection of sweetness in rhythm and metre. These are the essentials in the budding of a great poet. Afterwards habit and consciousness of power teach more ease—*præcipitandum liberum spiritum*."

By 1815 WORDSWORTH had learned to reverence what he had formerly despised, and in the "Essay, Supplementary to the Preface" affixed to the first

¹ But WORDSWORTH, in the essay of 1815 mentioned below, says (p. 353 n.) that STEEVENS's "flippant insensibility was publicly reprehended by Mr. Coleridge in a course of Lectures upon Poetry given by him at the Royal Institution."

volume of his *Poems* he assailed STEEVENS (pp. 352 f.) for sentiments previously shared by himself, incidentally telling that few people in England knew the sonnets: "There is extant a small Volume of miscellaneous Poems in which Shakespeare expresses his own feelings in his own Person. It is not difficult to conceive that the Editor, George Stevens [*sic*], should have been insensible to the beauties of one portion of that Volume, the Sonnets: though there is not a part of the writings of this Poet where is found in an equal compass a greater number of exquisite feelings felicitously expressed. But, from regard to the Critic's own credit, he would not have ventured to talk of an act of parliament not being strong enough to compel the perusal of these, or any production of Shakespeare, if he had not known that the people of England were ignorant of the treasures contained in those little pieces."¹ In similar terms the *Edinburgh Review*, 1816 (XXVII, 391), says that STEEVENS "would have convinced us he knew nothing of the poet, if he had only left that single opinion on record, in which he pronounces the sonnets of Shakspeare worth nothing. He had never heard Garrick, we suppose, recite them." Presumably Dr. Johnson could have heard such recitations, but his judgment corroborated that of Steevens.

The fine critic WILLIAM HAZLITT had no great love for Sh.'s non-dramatic verse. In 1815 (*Complete Works*, ed. P. P. Howe, 1933, XVI, 43 f.) he declared: "It is not improbable, that if Shakespear had written nothing but his sonnets and smaller poems, he would . . . have been assigned to the class of cold, artificial writers, who had no genuine sense of nature or passion." But such a judgment would be unjust; the reader must not let the conceited language of the poems blind him to their "rich vein of thought and sentiment." Two years later his opinion seems slightly higher (*Characters of Sh.'s Plays*, the same, 1930, IV, 360 f.): "Of the Sonnets we do not well know what to say. The subject of them seems to be somewhat equivocal; but many of them are highly beautiful in themselves, and interesting as they relate to the state of the personal feelings of the author. The following [25, 29, 102, 73] are some of the most striking. . . . In all these, as well as in many others, there is a mild tone of sentiment, deep, mellow, and sustained, very different from the crudeness of his earlier poems." Discussing this book, "PROH PUDOR" in *Blackwood's*, 1818 (III, 587 f.), used brutal language: Hazlitt's "of the Sonnets we do not well know what to say," it declares, is "a most luminous piece of philosophical criticism indeed." His "observations are uniformly very bad ones," "he rips up the seams of all his stolen speculation," "to him truth and falsehood are indifferent," here he writes "with his usual ignorance and arrogance," and "it is distressing to hear a gander thus gabbling at 'that divine swan.'" Unaffected by the Cockney-baiters, in 1822 HAZLITT (*Complete Works*, ed. Howe, 1931, VIII, 175) is confessing that Milton's sonnets are, except perhaps for Drummond's, "almost the first effusions of this sort of natural and personal sentiment in the language. . . . Shakespear's, which some persons better-informed in such matters than I can pretend to be, profess to cry up as 'the divine, the matchless, what you will,'—to say nothing of the want of point or

¹ In a note Wordsworth appended a list of twenty-seven sonnets that seemed to him especially good: 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 54, 64, 66, 68, 73, 76, 86, 91-93, 97, 98, 105, 107-109, 111, 113, 114, 116, 117, 129, "and many others."

a leading, prominent idea in most of them, are I think overcharged and monotonous, and as to their ultimate drift, as for myself, I can make neither head nor tail of it. Yet some of them, I own, are sweet even to a sense of faintness, luscious as the woodbine, and graceful and luxuriant like it," as 98. These sentiments Hazlitt bequeathed to his son, who, editing the sonnets in 1852, had little to say about the merits of these "inexplicable" and "very singular compositions," and to his grandson, who as late as 1902 and 1912 (see pp. 364 f., below) damned them vigorously.

They were not unintelligible to SHELLEY. In the fragments connected with *Epipsychidion* (*Poems*, ed. Ingpen and Peck, 1927, II, 380) he represents the supposed young English author of that strange poem as writing,

If any should be curious to discover
Whether to you I am a friend or lover,
Let them read Shakespeare's sonnets, taking thence
A whetstone for their dull intelligence
That tears and will not cut.

His brother-poet KEATS, so C. L. FINNEY (*Evolution of Keats's Poetry*, 1936, I, 95, 184 f.) records, "did not read Shakespeare's sonnets very closely before the spring of 1817." When he did begin, in March, 1817, "an intensive study of Shakespeare's poetry" "the elevated qualities of his style were influenced by his reminiscences" of the sonnets. "The crumbling of the Greek [or Elgin] marbles reminded him of Shakespeare's complaints [in 12] of the 'wastes of time.'" From Burford Bridge, near Dorking, in November, 1817 (Finney, I, 232 f.), Keats wrote to his friend Reynolds: "One of the three Books I have with me is Shakspear's Poems: I neer found so many beauties in the Sonnets—they seem to be full of fine things said unintentionally—in the intensity of working out conceits. Is this to be borne? . . . [He quotes 12.5–8.] He overwhelms a genuine Lover of Poesy with all manner of abuse, talking about—'a poet's rage And stretched metre of an antique song' [17.11 f.]. Which by the by will be a capital Motto for my Poem [*Endymion*], won't it? He speaks too of 'Time's antique pen' [19.10]—and 'april's first born flowers' [21.7]—and 'death's eternal cold' [13.12]." In imitation of Sh. Keats wrote "When I Have Fears" and sixteen other Shakespearean sonnets (Finney, I, 355).¹ But by April, 1819 (the same, II, 608 f.), he had decided that a Shakespearean sonnet "appears too elegiac—and the couplet at the end of it has seldom a pleasing effect." In an attempt "to discover a better Sonnet Stanza than we have" he experimented with irregular forms, but his attention was soon diverted to the ode, and after April, 1819, he wrote only two or three sonnets. The copy of the 1806 *Poems* once owned by Keats is described at length by CAROLINE F. E. SPURGEON (*Keats's Sh.*, 1928, pp. 38–42). She gives full details about how and where he marked lines and passages, and is evidently correct in saying (p. 39) that he read the work "with . . . passionate interest and excitement."

¹ According to L. J. ZILLMAN (*John Keats and the Sonnet Tradition*, 1939, p. 77) Keats wrote forty-five Petrarchan, sixteen Shakespearean, and six irregular sonnets.

By 1817, too, DRAKE had learned (what most of us know today) that practically every line of Sh.'s is sacred and beautiful, so that, forgetting his earlier impiety, he expresses great disdain (*Sh. and His Times*, II, 74) for "the absurd charge against, and the inadequate defence of, sonnet-writing, brought forward by Messrs. Steevens and Malone." After indicating various things to admire (though he wishes [pp. 79, 72] that the dark-lady sonnets, which reveal "poetical inferiority," "had never been published" or else "could be proved to have been perfectly ideal"), he insists (p. 84) that "the *Miscellaneous Poetry* of Shakspeare . . . possesses a value far beyond what has been attributed to it in modern times." Its "depreciation" up to 1817 "must be ascribed, in a great measure, to the unaccountable prejudices of Mr. Steevens." When STEEVENS says that Malone's editorial skill is disgraced by the poems on which it is employed (p. 85), "who can avoid feeling a mingled emotion of wonder and disgust? who can, in short, forbear a smile of derision and contempt at the folly of such a declaration?" Drake is pleased to hope that he has vindicated "the beauties of these calumniated poems" and refuted "the sweeping censure which they have so unworthily incurred." He is confident (p. 86) that they will permanently have "*no inconsiderable share of the admiration and the gratitude of posterity.*" The encomium of this "Tory ultra-Julian" rings hollowly on the ear.

Yet the *G. M.*, 1818 (LXXXVIII, ii, 334 f.), opposed "to the fashionable authority of Mr. Steevens," was convinced that on the poems "no man has ever thrown half so much light as Dr. Drake." The sonnets he "vindicates, most ably and clearly, from the unjust depreciation which they had suffered from the caprice of Mr. Steevens. . . . It will hardly be credited, by those who now examine the Sonnets of Shakspeare with an unbiassed mind, or peruse the just remarks of Dr. Drake upon them, that a man so acute and ingenious as Mr. Steevens could be so completely blind to their merit, as he has proved himself by his expressions on the subject." It is not "possible for any Reader of taste" to read the sonnets "without full conviction, both of the strange prejudice of Mr. Steevens, and of the exalted merit of the Poet." But this is too hard on STEEVENS, who, if he had been writing in 1817, might have turned his critical coat like Drake. The *British Critic*, 1818 (n. s., IX, 360 f.), voices similar praise of Drake, asserting that "those who love sonnets will not regret their trouble in perusing Shakspeare's; they are indeed unequal in merit, but we think we may venture to say, that there are few short productions in our language, which have so many beauties scattered up and down them." One of *Blackwood's* "young men" (1818, III, 585 f.) follows suit: "It was the fashion of critics, not long ago, to speak of Shakspeare's Sonnets as poor compositions; and Steevens, who probably was just as well qualified to judge of their merits as of his tragedies, condemned them as utterly contemptible, and not possible to be read, even under the compulsion of an act of parliament. This was an attempt at wit. . . . He was, however, a person of no small authority in his day—and it therefore passed current with many, for a sober and serious truth, that Shakspeare could not write sonnets worthy the perusal of Mr Steevens. The said Mr Steevens was a man somewhat difficult to be pleased." Sh.'s are said to rank high above all other Elizabethan sonnets. "They are full of wisdom; a single line often expresses a volume of truth,—and

many single lines might afford theses for the illustrations of the moralist or metaphysician." 29, 30, 54, 64, 98 are "exquisitely beautiful." The unregenerate EZEKIEL SANFORD (*Works of the British Poets*, 1819, III, 43) was uninfluenced by panegyrics of this sort, and was able to say nothing more flattering than that "many of the *Sonnets* have considerable smoothness of versification, and brilliancy of thought." Obviously he considered them inferior to all the other poems of Sh. except *Lucrece*.

STEEVENS passed in 1800 to whatever reward is reserved for scholars, MALONE in 1812. The text and notes of these eminent authorities were reissued in JAMES BOSWELL's variorum edition of 1821. Boswell declares (p. 3) that no other reason for reprinting *all* the poems need be given "than that the editor who undertakes to publish Shakspeare, is bound to present the reader with all his works. Mr. Steevens has, indeed, spoken of them with the utmost bitterness of contempt; but in the course of about forty years, the period which has elapsed since they were first described by that critick as entirely worthless, I will venture to assert that he has not made a convert of a single reader who had any pretensions to poetical taste." But that he was wrong the foregoing pages sufficiently prove. He was also wrong in asserting (p. 222) that "the poetical merits of Shakspeare's *Sonnets* are now . . . almost universally acknowledged," but right in saying (p. 363) that Malone had given "but scanty justice to these beautiful compositions."

As if to refute Boswell, a certain Y. J. (*New Monthly Magazine*, 1823, VII, 470, 473-476) maintained that Sh.'s poems are so eclipsed by the plays that "few have ever read them through." He admitted that many of them are beautiful, "in despite of conceits, and quibbles," and artificiality; but the monotony of subject-matter prevents placing them "in any high rank as specimens of sonnet-writing." A *Retrospective Review* author, taking as his text for retrospection Gentleman's 1774 edition, begins by saying (1823, VII, 381) that "the *Poems* have been relinquished by several successive generations, to almost entire neglect," but (pp. 391 f.) the sonnets "contain, perhaps, more absolute thought than any other poems of the same extent in our language. They have often the closeness (though not the turn) of epigrams." Milton's sonnets are (p. 393) the best in English. Those of Sh. are defective in form, monotonous in subject, and (p. 398) "harsh or quaint." None the less (p. 406), if they abound in quaintness, so do his plays, but we are used to *them*. The sonnets "are, the reader may be assured, of great value,—a little old-fashioned, but still precious."

W. S. LANDOR, as has been said, often paraded his animosity to sonnets in the English, but not to those in the Italian, language. In one of the *Imaginary Conversations*, 1823 (*Complete Works*, ed. T. E. Welby, 1927, V, 181), he utters his own views through the mouth of the Greek scholar Richard Porson, saying that in Sh.'s sonnets "there sometimes is a singular strength and intensity of thought, with little of that imagination which was afterward to raise him highest in the universe of poetry. Even the interest we take in the private life of this miraculous man cannot keep the volume in our hands long together. We acknowledge great power, but we experience great weariness."¹ Some twenty

¹ In the second day of *The Pentameron*, 1836, Boccaccio and Petrarch are represented as depreciating the sonnet.

years later, in an Imaginary Conversation with Southey (the same, V, 318), LANDOR declares: "Among all Shakespeare's not a single one is very admirable, and few sink very low. They are hot and pothery: there is much condensation, little delicacy; like raspberry jam without cream, without crust, without bread, to break its viscosity. But I would rather sit down to one of them again, than to a string of such musty sausages as are exposed in our streets at the present dull season."¹ SCOTT was of similar opinion. WILMON BREWER (*Sh.'s Influence on Sir Walter Scott*, 1925, p. 445) observes that, in his article on J. P. Kemble (*Quarterly*, 1826, XXXIV, 199), he cavalierly refers to Sh.'s "few sonnets forgotten among the numerous works of the Elizabethan age," and adds: "Scott seems to take no interest in the sonnets of other authors and never composed any himself." In striking contrast to this disparagement is the eulogy of that belated Elizabethan T. L. BEDDOES, who in a letter of May 13, 1827 (1935 ed., p. 633), speaks of "the deep & ardent expressions of that wondrous book of sonnets, where he [Sh.] has turned his heart inside out & given us all to read all that the tender & true spirit had written on the walls of his chamber"; the sonnets remind him of "the starry tremulous universal smile of an ocean of passion, which ebbed & flowed about the roots of a love, as firm & sacred as the foundations of the world."

The views of HARTLEY COLERIDGE (*Blackwood's*, 1828, XXIV, 573), himself an exquisite sonneteer, are of even more interest: Sh.'s sonnets, "which Stevens [*sic*] (bless his five wits!) talks of compelling people to read by act of parliament, . . . shew the profundity of his thoughts, his natural tendency toward metaphysical introversion and involution, which the necessity of composing for a mixt audience happily tempered in his dramas, . . . and, more than all, the noble modesty, which led him to esteem lightly all that he produced." ANNA JAMESON (*Memoirs of the Loves of the Poets*, 1829 [1833, I, 207 f.]), gushed over the sonnets, in which Sh. "appears to have been really heaven-inspired. . . . Every one who reads them, who has tenderness or taste, will echo Wordsworth's denunciation against the 'flippant insensibility' . . . [of STEEVENS], and will agree in his opinion, that they are full of the most exquisite feelings, most felicitously expressed."

But the author of *The Pleasures of Hope*, THOMAS CAMPBELL, considered such panegyrics indefensible. He had included only four sonnets (2, 54, 116, 145) to represent Sh. in his *Specimens of the British Poets*, 1819 (II, 286-288); and in the *New Monthly Magazine*, which he edited, he tells in 1829 (XXVI, 577) of having rejected an essay by a friend who "has discovered, as he imagines, in Shakspeare's sonnets, a clue to the entire history of the poet's life," and who "has lustily belaboured George Steevens, for daring to say that the strongest Act of Parliament would not be strong enough to enforce the popular reading of Shakspeare's sonnets, and even bestowed some flagellation on Mr. Malone for having so weakly defended them." Campbell then (p. 582) gives his own opinion: "Many of the Sonnets . . . express an unexaggerated friendship that is truly Shakspearian and endearing; and the fancy, harmony, and diction of

¹ Gerald Massey's poems (see the advertisement leaf in the Boston 1857 edition) got back-firing praise in LANDOR's comment: "There are thoughts and expressions here which remind us of Shakespeare in the best of his sonnets."

the greater portion of the whole collection betoken the hand of a master. They form, altogether, the best of our sonnet poetry anterior to that of Drummond; for George Steevens's comparison of them with Watson's productions is unworthy of an answer. If the same Commentator's question, '*What have truth and nature to do with sonnets?*' deserve any reply, we may simply extinguish it, by telling him that they have as much to do with the sonnet as with any other short species of poem." It is true that, like Petrarch's, they have "a certain monotonous effect. . . . There is no necessity, however, for our making a toil of a pleasure in reading the sonnets of either Shakspeare or Petrarch, for the character of *tædium* belongs not to those pieces individually, any more than the pressure of a crowd belongs to the presence of a single person. To say that these Sonnets add but little to Shakspeare's fame, is as excusable as to say that a considerable rock might appear but as a pebble if it were piled on the top of Olympus." In his edition of Sh.'s *Dramatic Works*, 1838 (1842 ed., p. xxvi), CAMPBELL concluded that some of the sonnets, "though not all, . . . [are] worthy of Shakspeare. . . . As a whole, however, . . . [they] are no more to our Poet's fame, than a snow-ball on the top of Olympus."

In the midst of all this discussion and just after editions of the sonnets and other poems had been published in 1820 (J. F. DOVE, London), 1821 (MILLER, London; SHERWIN, London), 1822 (JAMES STEEL, Whitehaven), 1825 and 1826 (WILLIAM PICKERING, London), JAMES BROUGHTON (*G. M.*, 1829, XCIX, i, 225 f.) lamented the absence of any good one-volume issue. "Can we then wonder," he asked, "that the Poems of Shakspeare are little read, and less understood, while they are known to the public only in so disfigured a state? It is most singular . . . that, while so many pens are constantly employed in illustrating the beauties and explaining the obscurities of his Plays, no one seems to consider his Poems worthy of similar attention, although they contain some of his sweetest ideas, and afford the only insight he has left us into his personal history." Broughton was speaking about all Sh.'s non-dramatic verse. In the very next year EDWARD MOXON published the *Sonnets of Sh. and Milton*, indulging (pp. iii f.) in some restrained comments on the older writer, and repeating the legend of his unfamiliarity to the public: "With the plays of Shakspeare every one is acquainted, but few have ever thought it worth their while to read those earlier efforts of his genius—his Sonnets. Yet they contain beauties, both of idea and expression, which, to the poetic mind and well-tuned ear, will often produce feelings of pleasure; and many, which, afterwards embodied in some one or other of his dramatic visions, have long since become familiar." Milton's sonnets, which "are better known and appreciated," receive higher praise; they are "gems of poesy" which cannot fail to "warm the imagination and elevate the heart." GEORGE SANDERLIN (*M. L. N.*, 1939, LIV, 464) believes that the appearance of Moxon's volume marks a stage in English sonnet history; that after 1830 "critics commonly coupled" the names of Sh. and Milton "as those of the masters of the English sonnet." But it seems to me very doubtful whether the date may be set so precisely, and whether these two great names were always, or even customarily, placed above Wordsworth's. Significantly, in reviewing Moxon's own *Sonnets*, 1837, J. W. CROKER (*Quarterly*, 1837, LIX, 209) emphatically remarked that even "the great examples of Shakspeare and Milton have failed to domesticate

it [the sonnet] with us." "The 'plot of ground' which is 'scanty' to an elephant," he went on, "is a wilderness to a mouse; and the garment in which Wordsworth might feel straitened hangs flabby about a puny imitator."¹

The sonnets were discovered by EDWARD FITZGERALD in 1832. With the greatest ardor he writes on November 27 (*Letters*, 1894, I, 14): "I have been reading Shakespeare's Sonnets: and I believe I am unprejudiced when I say, I had but half an idea of him, Demigod as he seemed before, till I read them carefully. How can Hazlitt call Warton's the finest sonnets? . . . I have truly been lapped in . . . [Sh.'s] for some time: they seem all stuck about my heart, like the ballads that used to be on the walls of London. I have put a great many into my Paradise, giving each a fair white sheet for himself: there being nothing worthy to be in the same page. I could talk for an hour about them." But Fitzgerald soon came to detest the lyric form, largely because of "Daddy" Wordsworth's "River Duddon" sequence and its unlucky fellows.²

By 1832 the editors, infected with romantic idolatry for Sh., began to change their tune. One of the first and best of them, ALEXANDER DYCE (ed. 1832, pp. lxxv f., lxxvii), none too gently belabors STEEVENS, calling his judgment of the sonnets "preposterous." He thinks that the dead scholar "did not declare his real opinion on the subject, as sincerity was not among his virtues." The clergyman-scholar, having thus conformed to *de mortuis nil nisi bonum*, continues: "About the excellence of these *Sonnets*, slightly disfigured as they are by conceits and quibbles, there can be no dispute. . . . They contain such a quantity of profound thought as must astonish every reflecting reader; they are adorned by splendid and delicate imagery; they are sublime, pathetic, tender, or sweetly playful; while they delight the ear by their fluency, and their varied harmonies of rhythm." No English sonnets except Milton's can equal them. None the less, Dyce ranks them below *all* the plays. With a similar lack of Christian charity he returns to the assault in his *Specimens* (1833, p. 213): "The transcendent beauty of Shakespeare's Sonnets is now universally felt and acknowledged; and the insolent contempt with which Steevens presumed to speak of them, is only remembered to the injury of the critic's reputation." In the *Athenaeum*, May 2, 1835 (p. 337), one reads: "'Scorn not the sonnet,' says Wordsworth. As far as we are concerned, there is no need of his vindication . . . for we are not among the 'critics who have frowned, mindless of its just honours;' and often remember the glorious little poems left us by Milton, and Shakspeare, and Drummond . . . [and Wordsworth]." That Milton's sonnets are better than Sh.'s, though the latter convey "sentiments of most exquisite and refined beauty," an anonymous critic in 1833 (*G. M.*, CIII, i, 618) had definitely implied.

It is remarkable how often Sh.'s sonnets were relegated to a lowlier position than that of some old or new poet. SIR EGERTON BRYDGES had a none too flattering opinion of them or of the form itself. "The brevity of the Sonnet,"

¹ Quoting this sentence with approval, THOMAS POWELL (*Living Authors of England*, 1849, p. 227), impolitely adds: "Were we a Suydam, or a John Jacob Astor, we would give a thousand pounds not to have Moxon's Sonnets in America, if we were compelled to read them."

² See p. 343, above.

he declares (Milton's *Poetical Works*, 1835 [1842 ed., p. xcii]), "will scarcely admit the greater traits of poetry. . . . The Sonnets both of Spenser and Shakspeare have been commended too much: they are quaint, laboured, and often metaphysical. Of all authors, Wordsworth has most succeeded in this department." But the author of "The Confessions of William Sh." in the *New Monthly Magazine*, 1835 (XLI, 7), lauds Sh. by attacking STEEVENS: "When Mr. Steevens says that the strongest Act of Parliament, framed on purpose, would never compel people to read these sonnets, we cannot help thinking Mr. Steevens an idiot on that point, and treating him accordingly." If Steevens had seen the alleged "Confessions," no doubt he would have plumed himself on his idiocy.

D. L. RICHARDSON in 1835 (*G. M.*, n. s., IV, 250) uttered the old, unjustified complaint: "It seems not a little extraordinary that the Sonnets of the immortal Shakspeare should be almost utterly neglected. When alluded to, as they rarely are, by modern critics, it is generally to echo the flippant insolence of Steevens." As reasons for the alleged (not real) neglect of the lyrics he assigns, first, "the equivocal nature of their subject, and secondly, the unpopular character of the sonnet, as a peculiar form of verse," and, third, "the enmity of Steevens, whose arrogant and tasteless criticisms have had a strange influence over succeeding commentators." Actually, STEEVENS seems to have had very little influence—except in making later critics feel wiser than he; but Richardson goes on (pp. 250 f.) to attack "the audacity and folly" of Alexander Chalmers's statements (see p. 349, above), and the "contemptuous silence" in biographies and encyclopedias, as a result of which "the mass of readers at the present day are not even aware that Shakspeare is the author of a volume of Miscellaneous Poems." He seems to have borrowed this notion (and its phraseology) from Wordsworth, and to have been unaware of the literature that had piled up in the twenty years since Wordsworth wrote. Richardson announces (p. 252) that Sh.'s "fourteen line effusions are very exquisite little poems, but they are not sonnets" (he means not Italian sonnets); he regrets (p. 254) "their defects as sonnets," and declares (p. 254 n.) Milton's "unquestionably the best in our language." An enthusiastic account of Sh.'s follows—though some of the edge is taken off by such pronouncements as that the final couplets have (p. 256) "a balanced melody, a point, and opposition" unexcelled "by Pope or Darwin"!

R. F. HOUSMAN included twenty-six of Sh.'s sonnets¹ in his *Collection* of 1835 (pp. 21-46). He expressed regret (p. 312) that "many of the Sonnets, unfortunately, are degraded by allusions and expressions which, however unexceptionable they were considered in the sixteenth century, could scarcely fail to encounter censure by the more fastidious taste of the nineteenth." All such he omitted, as well as others "abounding in exquisite thoughts and lines, but of unequal merit. . . . The lover of genuine poetry may be referred to the Sonnets of Shakespeare as to an inexhaustible mine of the most precious ore." The *New Monthly Magazine*, 1836 (XLVI, 508 f.), in reviewing Housman, praises the sonnet: "It is needless to say anything in praise of a kind of com-

¹ They are 15, 25, 27, 29, 30, 54, 55, 64, 71, 73, 89-91, 95, 97, 98, 102, 104-109, 111, 116, 129.

position on which the Muses of Milton and Wordsworth have employed their highest powers, and which, as the vehicle of a sudden burst of emotion, a single lofty meditation, or an energetic appeal, stands unrivalled by any other metrical arrangement of words." In his *Book of Gems*, 1836 (p. 104), S. C. HALL found it "impossible to speak too highly" of Sh.'s quatorzains: "In the profoundest thought, the truest refinement, and the most exquisite feeling of natural loveliness, they have never been excelled." STANHOPE BUSBY (*Lectures*, 1837, pp. 36-38) added that Sh. composed "the most nervous sonnets in our language. They have a consolidation of thought, a sterling and deep imagination, a terseness yet comprehensiveness of expression unrivalled, almost unattainable. . . . The sonnet is perhaps the most difficult style of poetical composition. . . . [To its writers] great poetic judgment, a delicate power of balancing words and concentrating ideas are indispensable; and these properties the mind of Shakspeare instinctively possessed. An epithet from his pen is often sufficient to form a picture. He has no redundancy of expletives, no rank luxuriance of words, but his images seem thrown off in the fervor of the moment, neither dilated nor distorted, following each other in rapid and continuous succession, yet each separate and complete. He surmounted the complexity of metre and the mechanical difficulties of verse with a master hand, and gave a splendor and variety to the sonnet, unknown in our language before his time."

A new era in study and criticism of these lyrics began with the publication in 1837 of JAMES BOADEN's *On the Sonnets of Sh.*, announcing the "discovery" of Mr. W. H. as Pembroke, and in 1838 of *Sh.'s Autobiographical Poems*, a book by Keats's intimate friend, C. A. BROWN. Henceforth, it became almost impossible to read the sonnets for themselves, to dodge a consideration of the sonnet "problems," and henceforth, too, "discoveries" and interpretations abounded. Neither Boaden nor Brown had any particular interest in Sh.'s poetry. The latter, who had discussed it many times with Landor, reached (pp. 47 f.) a far from favorable verdict: "Except as connected with Shakespeare, which is much, the subjects are uninteresting. The conceits and forced metaphors, which in his day seem to have been admired, may be forgiven by us; but the languid prolixity and monotony of cadence, pervading almost all the stanzas, are wearisome to modern readers. Besides, we soon cease to delight in the same thoughts, turned round and round, placed in different lights, and tricked out in quaint fancies. . . . Had he . . . 'made a pish' at fashion, and followed nature, the poems would also have been 'not of an age, but for all time.'" More condemnatory still was SAMUEL ROGERS, who in August, 1838 (E. J. Morley, *Henry Crabb Robinson*, 1938, II, 552), told his friend Robinson that he "allowed no merit to Shakespeare's Sonnets," a statement that must have made a considerable impact at the celebrated literary breakfasts near St. James's Park.¹ But Rogers was living in the Pleasures of Memory and Correctness. Just while he was damning the sonnets, according to THOMAS CARLYLE (*Lectures on . . . Literature*, 1838, ed. J. R. Greene, 1892,

¹ See also *Recollections of the Table-Talk of Samuel Rogers*, 1856, p. 149: "I cannot relish Shakespeare's *Sonnets*. The song in *As you like it*, 'Blow, blow, thou winter wind,' is alone worth them all."

p. 154) it was "universally admitted" that Sh. "must be regarded as the greatest person that has been produced in the literature of modern Europe." In 1843 the same zealot (*Historical Sketches*, ed. A. Carlyle, 1898, p. 22 n.) was proclaiming Sh. as "the beautifullest English soul this England confesses to have ever made, . . . the greatest thing, it appears, that we have yet done, and managed to produce in this world." Presumably in Carlyle's eyes the king of verse could do no wrong.¹

With the publication of HENRY HALLAM's *Introduction to the Literature of Europe*, 1839 (III, 289-291), a covillain to STEEVENS enters, giving the sonnets at least five major characters besides the author. Nobody could call Hallam an idiot or question his taste for poetry, so that his words were extremely influential. "These sonnets," he wrote, "were long overlooked; Steevens spoke of them with the utmost scorn, as productions which no one could read; but a very different suffrage is generally given by the lovers of poetry, and perhaps there is now a tendency, especially among young men of poetical tempers, to exaggerate the beauties of these remarkable productions. They rise indeed in estimation as we attentively read and reflect upon them. . . . No one ever entered more fully than Shakspeare into the character of this species of poetry. . . . No instance has been adduced of such rapturous devotedness, such an idolatry of admiring love, as the greatest being whom nature ever produced in the human form pours forth to some unknown youth in the majority of these sonnets." Yet "it is impossible not to wish that Shakspeare had never written them. There is a weakness and folly in all excessive and mis-placed affection, which is not redeemed by the touches of nobler sentiments that abound in this long series of sonnets. But there are also faults of a merely critical nature. The obscurity is often such as only conjecture can penetrate; the strain of tenderness and adoration would be too monotonous, were it less unpleasing; and so many frigid conceits are scattered around, that we might almost fancy the poet to have written without genuine emotion, did not such a host of other passages attest the contrary." Thus Hallam emphasized the notion that in the sonnets the god Sh. revealed all too clearly feet of clay, and other Victorian critics were disturbed by their dubious morality. As the *Edinburgh Review*, 1840 (LXXI, 467), phrased it: "Much that is most unpleasing in the circumstances connected with those magnificent lyrics, is removed by the air of despondency and remorse which breathes through those that come most closely on the facts; and there is no good reason for believing that Shakspeare himself voluntarily gave to the world those beautiful records of the errors of a great man."

ISAAC DISRAELI (*Amenities of Literature*, 1841, II, 204 f.) devotes less attention and eulogy to the sonnets than to the other non-dramatic verse. He calls them "effusions of the hour," of which, "possibly, some may have been descriptive of his [Sh.'s] own condition." But as in those days publishers "were not nice in the means they used to procure manuscripts," he is uncertain about what is genuine in Q. He mentions STEEVENS's "ejection" of the Sonnets, but is not much interested in this "ambiguous volume." Just as little interest had PETER CUNNINGHAM (editing in 1841 Thomas Campbell's *Specimens*, 1819, p. lxxi n.) in "these now over-rated productions of his [Sh.'s] muse

¹ See also p. 137, above.

(of which no one throughout is positively excellent)." He, too, was shocked by the apparent immorality behind them.

CHARLES KNIGHT, the publisher-editor of Sh., tells (*Passages*, 1864, II, 282 f.) that about 1811 he "had met with a little volume of the Sonnets. How well do I remember portions of those mysterious, and therefore more bewitching productions, in association with solitary walks in my native forest. That little volume was a treasure to me," and STEEVENS's contemptuous dismissal of it bewildering. Earlier (I, 206) Knight had written of the delight with which around 1817 he read the sonnets, "rarely published with the Plays, and known only to a few enthusiasts who did not believe, with Steevens, that they were sentimental rubbish." Stout Cortez's have a way of thinking themselves the discoverers of what rejoices their eyes. At any rate, when he edited the poems in 1838 and included the sonnets in his Pictorial Edition of Sh., 1841, Knight (1841, p. 156) paid his disrespects to STEEVENS but showed a lukewarm appreciation of the lyrics that scholar had denounced: "For a long time mankind bowed before the oracle [Steevens]; and the Sonnets were not read. . . . [But Sh.] was *always* in the heart of the people. There, in that deep, rich soil, have the Sonnets rested during two centuries; and here and there in remote places have the seeds put forth leaves and flowers. All young imaginative minds now rejoice in their hues and their fragrance." As for HALLAM, Knight admits (p. 113) that his regrets about Sh.'s having written the sonnets would be justified if they were not based on the unauthorized order of the sonnets in the 1609 quarto. But the correct order (that is, Knight's own rearrangement) changes the story which Hallam disliked. Knight objects (p. 157) to those who (and who *were* they?) "talk of the Sonnets as equal, if not superior, to the greatest of the poet's mighty dramas," comparing "things that admit of no comparison." His final judgment is hardly sound: "In the Sonnets, exquisite as they are, the poet goes not out of himself (at least in the *form* of the composition), and he walks, therefore, in a narrow circle of art. In . . . [*Venus* and *Lucrece*] the circle widens," and in the plays its "circumference [is] the Universe." So writes an editor in words that must have seemed tame (if she saw them) to MRS. BROWNING, soon to make herself famous as a sonneteer. In 1842 (*Poetical Works*, 1932, pp. 627, 638), with typical gush, she characterized Sh.'s efforts as "divine": "We recognize and bless them as short sighs from thy large poetic heart, burdened with diviner inspiration!" Likewise COLLIER (*Reasons for a New Edition of Sh.'s Works*, 1842, pp. 39 f.), contradicting STEEVENS and Malone, ventured to think "that Shakespeare's genius never shone forth with more intense brilliancy, his fancy never sported with more playful vigour, and the philosophy of his mind never displayed its depth and power more remarkably than in . . . [the poems and sonnets]: if he had left nothing else behind him, he would have merited to be placed among the first and greatest poets of the world."

In his once popular *Cyclopaedia*, 1844 (I, 105), ROBERT CHAMBERS wrote: "We almost wish, with Mr Hallam, that Shakspeare had not written these sonnets," for "they represent him in a character foreign to that in which we love to regard him." Here the black woman peers over the critical horizon, whence she brought distress to many others. Thus BIRCH (*Inquiry*, 1848, pp. 540-547) was shocked by Sh.'s "irreligious use" of ideas and phraseology

connected with religion "to serve mundane purposes." He deplored Sh.'s skepticism, his "irreverend riot" of theology, and concluded: "Hallam has justly said, that, for Shakspeare's sake, he wishes they had never seen the light—not from any critical estimate of the poetry, but from consideration of the subject." WALTER BAGEHOT in 1853 (*Sh.—the Man, Works*, ed. Mrs. R. Barrington, 1915, I, 246) felt similar qualms. The sonnets, to his mind, "are not the sort of verses to take any particular hold upon the mind permanently and for ever, but at a certain period they take too much. For a young man to read in the spring of the year among green fields and in gentle air, they are the ideal. As First of April poetry they are perfect." One such young man was DAVID MASSON, who in 1846, according to ROSALINE MASSON (*Sh. Personally*, 1914, p. 194 n.), had devoted "some months to what he afterwards called 'a fond juvenile study' of the *Sonnets*"—a study resulting in a youthful commentary (see p. 93, above), which Carlyle read and annotated.

Meantime, editions of the sonnets, separately or with the other poems and the plays, were multiplying. Indeed after 1830 scarcely a year passed without at least one edition's being published. ROBERT BELL's of 1855 was especially good. It received a highly flattering review in *Fraser's Magazine*, 1855 (LII, 398-411), in the course of which the critic prophesied (p. 407) that "the exquisite beauty of the Sonnets, and their comparative freedom from grossness, will always ensure them a place in the memory of every lover of poetry." Soon thereafter CHARLES BATHURST (*Remarks*, 1857, pp. 110 f.) descried in them "immense value." Some "certainly have the faults of repetition, conceits, and thin, if not trifling, matter. But others are among the very finest poems that can be produced; the very sweetest in versification, the richest in language, the deepest and most original in feeling and thought." Yet in 1863 HOWARD STAUNTON (*Sh.'s Songs and Sonnets*, p. iii) was bold enough to say that the sonnets "have never, in the present age, been estimated as they deserve. . . . Their want of due appreciation, we know," this belated pioneer goes on, "has been ascribed to the unworthy strictures of George Steevens, and it must be admitted that his adverse criticism on them had, for a time, a very prejudicial influence. But this influence has long passed away. No one now reads Shakspeare's Sonnets by the light of this commentator's wisdom. The simple truth appears to be, that these matchless effusions are not prized at the same worth as the Poet's Songs, because they are so much less known." W. S. JEVONS (*Athenaeum*, March 12, 1864, pp. 373 f.) estimated that between 1640 and 1830 there were only "some 12 issues of the poems, chiefly in the collected form, and for the sake of the sonnets. And in this," he adds, "popular taste has not erred, for the 'Venus,' and 'Lucrece,' and many of the sonnets are hardly to be regarded as more than extravagant examples of powerful imagination and description." His bibliographical figures are not very reliable (JAGGARD's *Sh. Bibliography*, 1911, lists around thirty complete editions before 1830), but his criticism may be taken for what it is worth.¹

But the old inhibitions persist. To THOMAS KENNY (*Life and Genius*, 1864,

¹ H. T. HALL (*Shakspearean Statistics*, 1874, p. 71) speaks of eighteen editions of the sonnets and forty-two collected editions of all the poems separate from the plays. I have not verified his figures.

p. 82) these poems "exhibit throughout a teeming, unchecked, more or less disordered profusion of thought and imagery in the mind of the writer. Diffusion is their most striking characteristic." He was (pp. 100 f.) "by no means prepared to adopt the petulant observation of Steevens. . . . The poems and the sonnets of Shakespeare are, we believe, decidedly inferior in breadth of imaginative conception, and in the flow and harmony of their numbers, to the best works of Spenser; but in all the essential qualities of poetry they seem to be at least equal to any other portion of the rhymed versification of that epoch. . . . But they never ascend into the higher and wider regions of passion and invention. They are marked by no originality or vigour of conception, by no special brightness or rapidity of expression. . . . [Sh.'s] whole work is feeble, diffuse, indistinct, without any concentrated interest of thought or feeling. . . . There is not a single sonnet, or a single passage in the poems, which the world greatly cares to remember. We do not even find in them all one phrase or image on which our memory perpetually lingers. They wear the light of none of those 'jewels, five-words long,' that are forever flashing from the depths of true poetic inspiration." The much-maligned STEEVENS scarcely surpassed this blanket condemnation.

MASSEY (*Quarterly*, 1864, CXV, 437) restored the balance with the comment, "Some of these sonnets are majestic as those of Milton, but clothed in a richer vesture of imagination." F. T. PALGRAVE (ed. 1865, p. 243) considered "nothing more remarkable or fascinating in English poetry than these personal revelations of the mind of our greatest poet. We read them again and again, and find each time some new proof of his almost superhuman insight into human nature; of his unrivalled mastery over all the tones of love." Hence he objected to HALLAM's criticism, while sympathizing with it: "We cannot bring ourselves to wish that 'Shakespeare had never written them,' or that the world should have wanted perhaps the most powerful and certainly the most singular, utterances of passion which Poetry has yet supplied. But there is pleasure also in the belief, that this phase of feeling was transient, and that the sanity which, not less than ecstasy, is an especial attribute of the great poet, returned to the Shakespeare whom, with Jonson, we 'love and honour, on this side idolatry, as much as any.'" GEORGE ROSS (*Studies*, 1867, p. 52) was more scrupulous. Many of the sonnets he admired—"they are as beautiful as the dawn of a summer day"; yet "it had been better, indeed, if some of them had never been written, for, whether they represent fact or fantasy, they are equally open to grave censure. We are not permitted to indulge in the cant of eulogy even to honour Shakspeare." To such cavilers the voice of old LEIGH HUNT came, as it were, from the grave (*Book of the Sonnet*, 1867, I, 77), declaring that Sh.'s lyrics "conquer all objection. Obscure and perplexing as some of them are, others contain passages of as exquisite poetry as any he wrote, and the best of them are veritable jewels."

The misinformed HENRY BROWN (*Sonnets of Sh.*, 1870, p. i), ignoring the plain evidence of bibliography, remarked that "the Sonnets . . . , till within the last few years, have been strangely neglected, and even now few readers of his dramatic works read these poems." On the contrary, a new edition, a new theory, a new translation, probably even new readers, were appearing each month. At any rate, the Mid-Victorians, battered by Swinburne and

the Fleshly School, quickly got over their abhorrence for Sh.'s themes. The *Quarterly*, 1873 (CXXXIV, 196), had no doubt that Sh.'s "may be placed in the very first rank of English sonnets: and although they have hitherto met with a limited appreciation (so great an authority as Hallam pronouncing it a matter of regret they were ever written), they are now, in their growing popularity, obtaining the high position they merit." R. H. LEGIS (*N. & Q.*, November 4, 1876, pp. 361 f.), believed that no man since Milton "had thoroughly penetrated the arcanum" of Sh.'s sonnets so well as Shelley; no one "since Milton [was] . . . capable of understanding them but that nearest approach to Shakspeare's own ideal, Shelley." This may be so, but not from want of explanations, solutions, keys. Yet in 1878 T. A. SPALDING (*G. M.*, CCXLII, 300) lamented that "there is a great tendency, even amongst the most earnest students of Shakspeare, to shirk the Sonnets." SWINBURNE had little to say about these lyrics, which he greatly admired, because (*Study of Sh.*, 1879, p. 62) upon them "such a preposterous pyramid of presumptuous commentary has long since been reared by the Cimmerian speculation and Bæotian 'brain-sweat' of sciolists and scholiasts, that no modest man will hope and no wise man will desire to add to the structure or subtract from it one single brick of proof or disproof." It did not occur to Swinburne—who was familiar (p. 307) with "the inestimable commentaries of Gervinus, Ulrici, and the Polypseudocriticopantodapomorosophisticometricoglossematographicomaniacal Company for the Confusion of Shakespeare and Diffusion of Verbiage (Unlimited)"—that the sonnets were, or had been for years, "neglected." Incidentally, he himself, while a student at Oxford in 1859, had closely imitated them in seven sonnets. "The genius of *pastiche*," GOSSE (Swinburne's *Undergraduate Sonnets*, 1918) remarks, "was never carried farther than in these *quatorzains*."¹

Adequately to discuss the vogue of Sh.'s sonnets since 1850 would be almost to write a history of English literature, scholarship, and criticism since that date. Only a few further details can be mentioned. A writer in *Blackwood's*, 1880 (CXXVIII, 163 f.), said: none of Sh.'s sonnets "impress my mind as do Milton's; they lack his stately grandeur, and fail to give the same satisfactory sense of perfect finish. They may be perfect in their own line; but it is a line, in point of art, laid on a lower level than Milton's." In 1882 SAMUEL WADINGTON (*English Sonnets*, pp. 223 f.) wrote: "One reads with astonishment the wondrous criticism of George Steevens to the effect that Thomas Watson was 'a more elegant sonneteer than Shakespeare.'" But his own wondrous comment (p. 236) is, "even the sonnets of Shakespeare or Milton seem to lose somewhat of their grandeur when compared with Mr. Rossetti's *Refusal of Aid between Nations*, or his noble sonnet entitled *The Sun's Shame*." But

¹ No such praise can be awarded to the anonymous author of "In Imitation of Sh.'s Sonnets" (J. C. Hutchieson's *Fugitive Poetry*, about 1878, p. 128), who "imitates" in this fashion:

"I saw a maid let fall a tender tear,
Which, as it travelled down her virgin cheek,
Did better tell me of her bosom's care,
Than all the language which her tongue could speak. . . ."

only three years later when WILLIAM SHARP edited the *Songs, Poems, and Sonnets*, 1885, he emphasized (pp. 274 f.) "the renascence" of their "influence in recent years," and directed special attention to its manifestations in D. G. ROSSETTI and in J. A. SYMONDS. Rossetti himself (W. M. Rossetti, *Dante Gabriel Rossetti*, 1895, I, 417), incidentally, had declared in 1871 that the form of sonnets was of little importance in itself, and that "a Shakespearean sonnet is better than the most perfect in form because Shakespear wrote it." To HALL CAINE (*Recollections*, 1882, p. 250) he named some forty of Sh.'s sonnets as "my special favourites." And about the staunchest Victorian of them all, TENNYSON (Hallam Tennyson, *Alfred Lord Tennyson, A Memoir*, 1897, II, 289), had no sympathy with HALLAM's "Victorian" qualms: "Henry Hallam," he remarked about 1883, "made a great mistake about them: they are noble. Look how beautiful such lines as these are:

'The summer flower is to the summer sweet,
Though to itself it only live and die' [94.9 f.],

and

'And peace proclaims olives of endless age' [107.8]."

To W. M. ROSSETTI (*Some Reminiscences*, 1906, I, 250) TENNYSON "spoke of the greatness of quality in Shakespear's sonnets; adding that in early youth he had even been wont to maintain that they surpassed his dramas, 'but of course I have long given up that exaggerated notion.'" In *Memoriam*, R. H. SHEPHERD (*Tennysoniana*, 1866, pp. 58 f.) had noted, was written after "a deep and probably recent study" of these noble lyrics, and abounds in "coincidences of idea" and "unconscious echoes" of them, a number of which he listed (pp. 60-75). An equally great admirer was GEORGE GISSING, who in 1883 (*Letters*, 1927 ed., pp. 132 f.) enumerated what he esteemed the best of Sh.'s sonnets (27-30, 33, 44, 54, 55, 59, 64, 66, 71, 73, 86, 90, 98, 102, 106, 107, 110, 111, 116, 119, 144), "some of them . . . perhaps the finest lyrical poetry ever written. . . . Every word is full-burdened with meaning, every line is a cadence of music."

If ROBERT SHINDLER (*G. M.*, CCLXXII, 76) is to be credited, in 1892 the sonnets were "spoken of with some hesitation, as if they needed apology or excuse." But no touch of apology mars the almost rhapsodical praise in the fine edition of GEORGE WYNDHAM (ed. 1898, pp. cxlvi f.). "The wonder" of Sh.'s sonnets, he explains, "lies in the art of his poetry, not in the accidents of his life; and, within that art, not so much in his choice of poetic themes as in the wealth of his IMAGERY, which grows and shines and changes: above all, in the perfect execution of his VERBAL MELODY. That is the body of which his IMAGERY is the soul, and the two make one creation so beautiful that we are not concerned with anything but its beauty." SAMUEL BUTLER, who in 1898 (H. F. Jones, *Samuel Butler*, 1919, II, 295) had stigmatized the sonnets as abounding "with slovenliness, crabbedness, and obscurity," by 1900 (the same, II, 317), the year after his own edition appeared, was calling them "the most wonderful things, to me, in all literature." Yet much of the wonder appears to have been provided by Mr. W. H., the sea-cook, Sh.'s partner in unmentionable sins.

W. C. HAZLITT (*Shakespear*, 1902), unlike Butler, almost exhausted the

vocabulary of contempt and vituperation: the sonnets are "philosophical, misanthropic, bitter, sad, and weak" (p. 180), "poor and rough lines" (p. 200), "dull and unintelligible with some tincture of licentiousness" (p. 202), "wretched lines" (p. 214), "wild and vague utterances" (p. 216). "The entire work is of the same second-rate leaven—a companion to the sonnets of Constable, Watson, and Barnfield" (p. 205). "Small, very small loss to the world and to the fame of the writer had it been, if the MS. had perished" (p. 203). Even stronger language occurs in the 1912 edition (pp. 213, 241–245). Whatever Hazlitt's demerits as a critic, he was a good hater and a bold man. More restrained than he but nearly as apologetic were COURTHOPE and BEECHING. The former (*History*, 1903, IV, 35) considered it reasonable for some twentieth-century critics to "share Hallam's wish that they had never been written"; and Beeching (ed. 1904, p. lxvi), with 127–152 in mind, remarked, "So far as not a few of these sonnets are concerned, we may feel, in the familiar words of Hallam, that 'it is impossible not to wish that Shakespeare had never written them.' Except for the magnificent Sonnet 129, the loss to the world would not have been great had they perished."

It seems doubtful that Sh.'s lyrics have in recent years received more praise than blame. Certain enthusiasts have endorsed or duplicated the judgment of GEORGE SAINTSBURY (*C. H. E. L.*, 1910, V, 263), "In the *Sonnets* the absolute high water mark of poetry is touched, at least for those who believe . . . that poetry does not so much consist in the selection of subject as in the peculiar fashion of handling the subject chosen." Others, ignoring the plea of C. F. JOHNSON (*Sh. and His Critics*, 1909, p. 133) that in "Christian charity" STEEVENS's opinion about the sonnets be left in "its proper obscurity," continue to attack him with wearisome reiteration: the "arrogance and ignorance he displayed" troubled PETER ALEXANDER as late as 1929 (*Sh.'s Henry VI*, p. 136).

One is tempted impatiently to ask why the long-dead STEEVENS should be belabored for expressing opinions that are endlessly duplicated in our own day. A few typical examples, varying from the mild to the severe, may be cited.

JOHN DAVIDSON (in Lee, ed. 1907, pp. xix f.): "In following the fashion he [Sh.] adopted a form which hampered the movement of his mind, and crippled his imagination. The feebleness of the tag which concludes, is in sad contrast with the splendid energy which opens, almost every sonnet." He "is tethered by the form and fettered by rhyme."—MASEFIELD (*William Sh.*, 1911, p. 247): "Beautiful as many of the sonnets are, they are less wonderful achievements and less important to the soul of man than the plays. Few people thought much of them until the degradation of the English theatre had hidden from English minds the greater glory of the creative system. That they are now widely read while the plays are seldom acted, is another proof that this age cares more for what was perishing and personal in Shakespeare than for that which went winging on, in the great light, surveying the eternal in man."—LUCE (*Sh. the Man*, 1913, p. 63): "As a whole, the sonnets are scarcely great enough for the Shakespeare of the *Merchant of Venice*, certainly not for the Shakespeare of *Hamlet*, and they are worlds away from the Shakespeare of *Othello* or *Antony and Cleopatra*. At their best they never reach that finish or that height, and at their worst they sink below the *Venus* and the *Lucrece*."—T. W. HUNT (*English Literary Miscellany* [1st series], 1914, p. 211): "[The

sonnets have] enough stanzas [*sic*] of merit and scattered lines of genuine verse to reveal the poet's lyric art" but are "not to be compared with the plays"; "that Shakespeare wrote sonnets at all is somewhat surprising, and equally so that he wrote them as well as he did."—FORREST (*Five Authors*, 1923, p. 10), reading the sonnets east of Suez: "Shakespeare simply *couldn't* have written some [that is, about one hundred twenty-two poems] of this rubbish."—LAURA RIDING and ROBERT GRAVES (*Survey of Modernist Poetry*, 1927, p. 78): "Steevens' view was the general one; . . . and if Malone by his emendations, which have become the accepted Shakespearian text, had not overridden the general critical opinion of the *Sonnets* and presented them fileted to the plain man, the plain man of to-day would undoubtedly be unaware of the existence of the *Sonnets*."—ARTHUR LYNCH (*London Review of Reviews*, 1930, LXXX, 308, 311 f.) boasts of not being "among the fervid admirers" of the sonnets, which are "composed with a laborious and not very happy art"; "ingenious exercises in flattery" carried "to the degree of gross sycophancy," not one is free from "technical flaws," not one can rank with any sonnet of Keats.

No severer critic than ARCHIBALD STALKER (*Sh. and Tom Nashe*, 1935) has ever assailed the sonnets, even if he aims his mudballs only at those "falsely attributed" to Sh. He applauds both HALLAM and STEEVENS, saying, through the mouth of Lamb (p. 24),¹ "I understand . . . what one critic meant when he said that he wished Shakespeare had not written the sonnets. I think that of all the commentators he was the only one so far to give a hint of plain honest judgment," and through the mouth of Coleridge (pp. 55 f.), "I go farther than Steevens and say that in the thirty-six plays so far as they are Shakespeare's you will find no conceits of the prosy and even stupid kind that you find in many of the sonnets. . . . I see now in Steevens's sustained abuse of the sonnets the plain recognition that many of them were not poetry at all." The ghost of Steevens might well be pardoned for crying out, "A Daniel come to judgment."

As recently as 1933 LORD ALFRED DOUGLAS (*True History*, p. vi) was declaring that "very few, even among the most cultivated, really read the *Sonnets* (except perhaps about a dozen of the best known)." It is difficult to prove or disprove such a statement. If someone should collect the references in the letters, journals, essays, poems, novels, and plays of contemporary Britons, probably the collection would indicate a fairly wide knowledge of the sonnets. Offhand one would not believe that the Bloom-Dedalus gang of JAMES JOYCE's *Ulysses*, 1922, had read them; but such unquoted quotations² as "a bay where all men ride" (p. 188), "uneared wombs," "did not break a bedvow" (p. 194), and "Will in overplus" (p. 201) confound the unbeliever. Possibly, too, the widespread use of sonnet-phrases for the titles of books³ indicates some popular knowledge.

¹ As both Lamb and Coleridge died in 1834, the anachronism is engaging.

² These, as well as the quotations from *Venus* and *Lucrece* (as on pp. 183, 189), are not included in B. J. MORSE's "Mr. Joyce and Sh." (*E. S.*, 1931, LXV, 367-381), but a few are noted in JOSEF BAAKE's *Riesenscherzbuch Ulysses*, 1937.

³ See the incomplete list (not all are English) in TANNENBAUM, 1940, nos. 421-440. A recent example is PAMELA H. JOHNSON's *Too Dear for My Possessing*, 1940. See also p. 376 n., below.

MALCOLM MUGGERIDGE, a London journalist who, in *The Sun Never Sets*, 1940 (pp. 154, 213), quotes Sh.'s sonnets and otherwise reveals literary tastes that would perhaps injure his professional standing in any other country than England, has some witty remarks (p. 206) on the Sh. mania: "Each generation gets . . . the Shakespeare it deserves. He is assimilated by each successive phase of human folly; a process which is facilitated by the fortunate chance that little is known about his life, and that his works are so comprehensive that even temperance reformers can find sustenance in them. To Victorian critics like Dowden, he had every Victorian virtue, including financial and social success. . . . With the publication of *The Portrait of Mr. W. H.*, the Sonnets came into their own, and homosexuals were heartened to feel that there was no *prima facie* reason why they should not have written *Hamlet*." Since the time of Swinburne scholars and critics have often viewed with alarm the mountains of "literature" and "scholarship" that threaten to overwhelm them and to submerge the sonnets. About the latter "more folly has been written," CHAMBERS (*William Sh.*, 1930, I, 561) says truly, "than about any other Shakespearean topic." On the other side of the Atlantic, TANNENBAUM, 1940 (p. vii), with the bitter disillusionment of a professional bibliographer, complains: "The *Sonnets* have interested scholars and would-be scholars only because they furnish bases for so much controversy and because they give cranks opportunities to gratify the *furor scribendi*." There is no indication, even in the grim days of a world war, that this *furor scribendi* will subside. Are not we all busily engaged in piling a new Pelion of scholarship and criticism on an Ossa long since defaced by Time's fell hand?

AMERICA

The first American edition of Sh. appeared in Philadelphia during 1795-1796 (see pp. 39 f., above), and has the distinction of being the first to be published outside the British Isles. According to H. N. PAUL (American Philosophical Society *Proceedings*, 1936, LXXVI, 722), JOSEPH HOPKINSON, then twenty-five, "promoted this enterprise and for it wrote the Preface, and the Life of Shakespeare. . . . This Preface is the first Shakespearean Essay of American authorship." To the non-dramatic verse, however, it pays very little attention (I, xii): "That no part of this author may be lost, we have added to the present Edition his poems. Though not destitute of merit, they are confessedly inferior to his dramas. . . . They possessed [*sic*] one peculiar advantage. Some of them were published by the Author himself, and all of them, the two last excepted, in his lifetime."¹ Meanwhile, L. G. STERNER (*Sonnet in American Literature*, 1930, p. 1) notes, the first American sonnet had been written in July, 1776, by Colonel David Humphreys, a Yale graduate, who served as Washington's aide-de-camp and later as minister to Portugal and Spain.² He calls (pp. 3-5) Royall Tyler (1757-1826) the second and

¹ The reference is to "Come live with me and be my dear" and "Why should this a desert be," on which see pp. 21, 29, 35 n., 36, above.

² H. C. DAVIDSON, in a study of "The Sonnet in Seven Early American Magazines and Newspapers" (*American Literature*, 1932, IV, 180-187), observes that none of Humphreys's sonnets was published before 1804, refers to

Samuel Low (born 1765) the third of our sonneteers. Originating simultaneously with American independence, the quatorzain "found almost universal [*sic*] favor" (p. xi) in the new land and home of the free and the brave—such favor that Sterner (pp. 123–128, 142 f.) is able to enumerate two hundred three of its practitioners from 1776 to about 1910 and to tabulate their handiwork as including 4174 Italian, 1271 Shakespearean, and 1595 "compromise" and irregular forms—a total of 7040. Perhaps a Steevens and an Act of Congress to suppress many of these effusions would have been welcomed.

Early American sonneteers showed no interest in Sh.'s lyrics. Mrs. Charlotte Smith's, however, were well known. JOSEPH DENNIE's *Farmers' Museum*, 1801, of Walpole, New Hampshire, with subscribers from all the New England states except Rhode Island, from New York, New Jersey, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and the District of Columbia, passed over Sh. in silence but had a great time (see *The Spirit of the Farmers' Museum*, 1801, pp. 79 f., 291, 311–314) in ridiculing "The plaintive and affected style" of Mrs. Smith, which "is familiar . . . to most readers." According to WESTFALL (*American Shakespearean Criticism*, 1939, p. 270), Sh.'s sonnets "were not mentioned by any writer until 1806" and, indeed, received little critical attention "prior to 1866." In the *Port Folio*, 1806 (n. s., I, 385–389), one "DAVID DIARY" spoke of "the collection of his [Sh.'s] numerous sonnets; a collection which scarcely enjoys, I think, the reputation it deserves," but which should please "those who delight in the strength, simplicity and harmony of language; and who see . . . the high degree in which the English language is susceptible of these beauties." David quoted 1–17, and commented (see pp. 243 f., above) none too intelligently on each.

The evidence of editions of Sh. indicates that the vogue of the sonnets in America largely parallels that in the British Isles. The poems were omitted in most of the early editions, but were included in the Boston editions of 1802–1812 (see pp. 34–36, above), which ran to about three thousand copies each. J. M. HUBBARD (*New York Nation*, 1883, XXXVII, 183) declares that the second Boston edition "did more to introduce the reading of Shakespeare in this country than any other before or since." Its subscribers included residents of New York, Albany, Schenectady, Trenton, and Charleston, South Carolina, as well as of New England. The publishers, Hubbard notes, made special efforts "to induce the students in the various colleges to subscribe, and with marked success . . . [except for Yale]. In the list of subscribers . . . [are] the names of more than half of the students of Harvard, 99 out of about 175, including those of Edward Everett and Richard H. Dana, the poet. Brown comes next with 28, Union with 17, and Dartmouth with 7." H. W. SIMON (*Reading of Sh.*, 1932, p. 8) explains: "Shakespeare was not required—not even offered as an elective—and half of Harvard was reading him. . . . Shakespeare was an attractive forbidden fruit, and it was fashionable for undergraduates to indulge their appetites. But in the classroom he was never read, and referred to only occasionally in classes in rhetoric." Yale, however, seems to have had a deep-rooted prejudice against the dramatist. As Simon (pp.

various sonnets by other Americans earlier than that date, and adds "ninety-one original sonnets" published in or before 1800 not known to Sterner.

122-124) remarks, some slight reading in the plays was required for entrance by Harvard in 1873, Michigan in 1877, Cornell and Columbia in 1882, but Yale, solitary among the New England colleges, held out against Sh. until 1895.

The early American publishers always followed some British edition, a fact that generally explains the omission or inclusion of the sonnets. The latter did appear in New York editions of Sh. in 1837, 1839, and 1841, as well as in FREDERICK CAMPE and COMPANY's *Poetical Works of William Sh.*, "Nurnberg and New York," 1837, and in countless reissues and new editions since. All these books were welcomed by readers and buyers. JAMES FENIMORE COOPER, for example (probably after his expulsion from Yale in 1805!), read Sh. avidly, and, E. P. VANDIVER, JR. (*S. A. B.*, 1940, XV, 110), tells us, quotes in his novels more than 1100 lines from thirty-six plays, *Venus*, and *Lucrece*, but "strangely enough, the sonnets are apparently not quoted at all." Yet among Cooper's contemporaries they had one very important reader and student. EMERSON characterized them in 1831 (*Journals*, ed. E. W. Emerson and W. E. Forbes, 1909, II, 422) as "in their way . . . as wonderful as the plays, and perhaps . . . even more valuable to the analysis of the genius of Shakspeare." Their most striking quality "is the assimilating power of passion that turns all things to its own nature." "How remarkable every way," he wrote in 1834 (the same, 1910, III, 290), "are Shakspear's sonnets." Readers of the *New-York Mirror*, August 22, 29, 1835 (XIII, 60-62, 68 f.) and the Philadelphia and New York *Museum of Foreign Literature and Science*, 1835 (XXVI, 281-285, 568-571, XXVII, 289-299, 558-569) probably agreed that the sonnets were remarkable after they had read the sensational anonymous articles called "The Confessions of William Shakspeare" there reprinted from the *New Monthly Magazine*. Yet the dislike of the sonnet as a form so noticeable in England was also reflected in America. Thus the *Southern Review*, 1832 (VIII, 460) professes "our decided partiality" for the sonnet, only to add that "more than any other kind of poetry, it abhors mediocrity"; "it is artificial, and therefore, frigid, unless it be redeemed by surpassing excellence." Again in June, 1836, Wordsworth's financial guide and editorial friend HENRY REED, a University of Pennsylvania professor (*American Quarterly Review*, XIX, 420-442; *Lectures*, 1857, II, 235-271), made some interesting observations on the English sonnet, to which, he said (pp. 420 f.), justice had not been meted. "Its quality is not held in very high repute," its very claim to the title *poetry* "is regarded as somewhat doubtful." Even those who do not neglect it have an "unkindly" feeling for it. They give it the look "which is cast coldly and doubtingly upon a stranger or foreigner. While the sonnet is read, an *un-English* feeling is found to be creeping about the heart." Reed goes on (pp. 423 f., 430 f., 440) to defend the sonnet against Johnson ("Samuel Johnson! in charity we are bound to hope that you are forgiven, but verily we have our fears") and others. "For its most perfect conception and execution, it demands . . . powers as great and varied as the epic itself." "It was not too narrow for the spirit of Shakspeare." "Let no one look upon the little poem with a hasty superciliousness. . . . It has been the retreat of poetic genius of the first rank." Basing his defense largely on the superlative compositions of Sh., Milton, and Wordsworth, Reed ends by saying (p. 442), "The public taste for the sonnet is reviving." Sonnets in general and Sh.'s in particular continued to be defended in the *American Quarterly*. In September,

1836 (XX, 70), a reviewer of Wordsworth quoted lines from 55, 81, and 107, and commended Sh., who without egotism, had "as deep an assurance of being immortal, as if the events of ages were figured before him." In the December number (XX, 492; *Lectures*, 1857, II, 295) REED¹ says that "the reader familiar with Shakspeare's sonnets—and who that loves his own language is not?—will not infrequently find them recalled to his mind" by the poems of Hartley Coleridge, under review; while a critic of W. C. Bryant (p. 507) referred to Sh.'s sonnets as "wonderful poems, of more difficult imitation, perhaps, so far as mere construction is concerned, than any other in the language."

A Virginia critic (*Southern Literary Messenger*, 1837, III, 706) confessed: "Until we read the sonnets of Wordsworth, it was our opinion, that this was not a form of poetry suited to the genius of our language. . . . Shakspeare and other English poets have written sonnets; but with all their unquestioned beauties, they have never become popular, and their merits are independent, if not in despite, of the form in which they are composed." Wordsworth's sonnets, indeed, opened the eyes of many readers. Another Virginian, J. F. OTIS (the same, 1838, IV, 130-132), protested against "the arguments which critics [like the foregoing] are too much in the habit of using, while attempting to decry" the sonnet form in general and Sh.'s use of it; and the *American Monthly*, 1838 (n. s., V, 286) insisted that the sonnet, of which "we are great lovers . . . is a small and pleasant cage for a winged fancy, confining its flight within fourteen measured bars. It binds the bright idea, as it were with jesses, preventing it from wandering loosely abroad, and over too much space." In the *United States Magazine*, 1840 (VII, 190 f.), B. F. BUTLER printed four "Sonnets on the Sonnet," the first beginning, "I love the Sonnet," and citing Dante, Petrarch, Sidney, Spenser, Milton, and Wordsworth, as well as "peerless SHAKSPEARE [who] doth its notes repeat." Soon a third *Southern Literary Messenger* critic (1841, VII, 311) was exclaiming of Sh., "And his sonnets—how perfect, how superior to all other poems of the kind ever produced!" In the same year a writer in the New York *Arcturus* (1841, III, 25-27) was praising *Venus* and the sonnets as full of "exquisite sensibility." "There are," he went on, "more eloquent, more heroic sonnets, full of a god-like expression," but 98, which he reprinted, is "one of those in which cheerfulness, an amiable sensibility predominate. Besides it is not hackneyed." Not long afterwards in Boston W. E. CHANNING (see G. W. COOKE, *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, 1885, XIX, 263) contributed anonymously to Emerson's magazine, the *Dial* (1842, III, 81), a sonnet noteworthy for its subject-matter and date:

TO SHAKSPEARE.

As the strong wind that round the wide Earth blows,
Seizing all scents that shimmer o'er the flowers,
The sparkling spray from every wave that flows
Through the proud glory of the summer hours,
Sweet questioning smiles, and gentle courteous glances,
The stately ship that stems the ocean tide,

¹ Reed also has favorable remarks on Sh.'s sonnets in his *Lectures*, I, 176 f.

The butterfly that with the wild air dances,
 And radiant clouds on which the Genii ride,
 Bearing all these on its triumphant way,
 Sounding through forests, soaring o'er the sea,
 Greeting all things which love the joyous day,
 In life exulting, freest of the free;
 Thus do thy Sonnets, Shakspeare, onward sweep,
 Cleaving the winged clouds, stirring the mighty deep.

By this time the first important collector of Shakespeareana, T. P. BARTON, had begun to amass the books now in the Boston Public Library. Around 1844, too, H. N. HUDSON was delivering popular lectures, in the course of which (*Lectures on Sh.*, 1848, I, 29) he described the sonnets as abounding "in the conceits and affectations of the time," though "many of them are to be ranked among the finest in the language; among those of Spenser, and Milton, and Wordsworth." This last poet was the inspirer of C. P. CRANCH (*Poems*, 1844, pp. 96 f.) who begins his first "Introductory" sonnet, "'Scorn not the Sonnet': thus hath sung the Bard Of holy Faith and calm Philosophy," and his second, "I'll love the Sonnet then for its own sake, And calmly hold my quiet course along," as he then does in nineteen succeeding poems. But at the very same time T. W. P. (*Knickerbocker*, 1844, XXIII, 283 f.), with somewhat heavy humor, was saying that ever since the days of Petrarch "mankind have suffered more or less from the chronic infliction of Sonnets. . . . Little danger was to be apprehended for Italian temperaments, except a degree of languor, general debility, and a disagreeable singing in the ears. It was only when it worked its way into English blood, that the virus assumed its most baneful character. SHAKSPEARE, among other illustrious victims, was afflicted by it in his youth, but seems to have recovered during his residence in the metropolis." Then followed some humorous advice, supposedly extracts from a forthcoming book, on "The Easiest Way of Discharging a Sonnet," its purpose being to modify and regulate "the mental health of our country."

Meanwhile, EMERSON's admiration for the sonnets had somewhat abated, and in his lecture on Sh., 1845¹ (printed in *Representative Men*, 1850 [*Complete Works*, 1903, IV, 189-219]), he referred to them (p. 214) with no particular stress: "The sonnets, though their excellence is lost in the splendor of the dramas, are as inimitable as they; and it is not a merit of lines, but a total merit of the piece; like the tone of voice of some incomparable person, so is this a speech of poetic beings, and any clause as unproducible now as a whole poem." EMERSON finally (*Journals* [1868], 1914, X, 249) arrived at the conclusion that, like the *P. & T.*, they were only poet's poems: "Loosely we might say, Shakspeare's Sonnets are readable only by poets, and it is a test of poetic apprehension, the value which a reader attaches to them."

In 1847 H. W. BARRETT (*American [Whig] Review*, VI, 304-309) expressed the conviction that "most readers of Shakspeare neglect his Sonnets alto-

¹ The date is uncertain. BLISS PERRY (*Heart of Emerson's Journals*, 1926, p. 210) and the *Dictionary of American Biography*, 1931 (VI, 138) assign the lectures to 1845, J. E. CABOT (*Memoirs*, 1887, II, 473) to 1845-1846, O. W. FIRKINS (*Ralph Waldo Emerson*, 1915, pp. 116 f., 196) to 1847.

gether." To help remedy that regrettable situation Barrett's essay, excellent for its date, went into some detail about the various "problems" and stressed the autobiographical value of the sonnets. No surer way of interesting readers could, or can, be devised. Simultaneously, however, W. A. JONES (*Literary Studies*, 1847, pp. 60 f.)¹ was telling readers that the sonnets "do not raise Shakspeare to a higher rank than he before attained. . . . On no one occasion does he attempt to reach a higher pitch than was attained by the general attempts in the same form of poetry. . . . His phrases, his expressive language, are . . . comparatively wasted on trivial themes, or levelled to a moderate keynote of passion. They contain none of the deep contemplativeness of Wordsworth, or the spirited yet condensed power of Milton." Yet, "for any other bard, it would be praise enough to have equalled the least valuable works of Shakspeare, and these sonnets would make the reputation of almost any one else," but "the two finest occur," not in *Q*, but in *Love's Labor's Lost*. Somewhat incidentally G. W. P. (*American [Whig] Review*, 1848, VIII, 45-47) discussed the merits of the sonnets, all of which, he thought, have a "wonderful condensation and peculiar freedom of language," their form being "the most purely artistic and difficult of any." If the comments of Emerson, Reed, Barrett, and Jones attracted few general readers to the lyrics, perhaps J. C. HART (*Romance of Yachting*, 1848, p. 228), one of the earliest anti-Stratfordians, helped by approving the assertion, "all his sonnets are licentious," and by condemning Sh.'s "libidinous lines to his mistress." Of a totally different nature was the well-informed essay on "Sh.'s Sonnets" contributed by J. S. HART to the Philadelphia *Sartain's Magazine*, 1849 (V, 153-157), which he edited. Hart, a Princeton graduate and a scholar of distinction, gave a short review of critical and scholarly opinion up to 1849. In a later article (V, 217-223) he asserted that a great change in opinion has come about since the day when "even" STEEVENS denied "the omnipotence of an Act of Parliament to make people read the Sonnets. Now, they are regarded by the very highest critical authorities, as well as by many an unlettered reader whose 'heart has been attuned thereto,' as magnificent lyrical compositions, in all respects worthy of the author of the Dramas." With these remarks one may contrast a statement in *Holden's Dollar Magazine*, 1848 (II, 420): "Shakspeare's sonnets though embodying as much of his mighty genius and command of language as any of his world-renowned plays, are comparatively little known, except to his most enthusiastic admirers."

By the middle of the century the *Literary World*, 1850 (VII, 348 f.) was lamenting that "Shakspeare is not popular in America," and expressing the hope that he "may become something more than a mere name." Its gloom was scarcely justified. American readers had no difficulty in finding the sonnets either in sets of Sh.'s complete works or in separate volumes—like the Philadelphia *Poems* of 1851 and the Hartford *Poems* of 1852.² In 1851 HUDSON's edition of the works began to appear, and he issued the volume (XI) containing the poems and sonnets in 1856. Though he was the first American

¹ These remarks first appeared in the *Boston Miscellany*, 1842, II, 106.

² O. A. ROORBACH, *Bibliotheca Americana*, 1852, lists among publications from 1820 to 1852 four separate editions of Sh.'s poems. In his *Addenda*, 1858, he includes a reissue, 1856, of Dyce's 1832 edition.

editor of real importance, Hudson's critical and scholarly endowments were less impressive than his ability to imitate and borrow; and so one is not surprised to read his unoriginal statements (p. 122) that some of the sonnets "would hardly do credit to a school-boy, while many are such as it may well be held an honour even to Shakespeare to have written; there being nothing of the kind in the language at all approaching them, except a few of Milton's and a good many of Wordsworth's. That in these the Poet should have sometimes rendered his work excessively frigid with the euphuistic conceits and affectations of the time, is far less wonderful than the exquisite beauty . . . of sentiment and imagery that distinguishes a large portion of them." These words unabashedly recur in HUDSON's 1881 edition (p. 86). J. D. W.'s opinion (*American Whig Review*, 1851, XIV, 317) was very different. He characterizes "the early style" of Sh., in his poems and sonnets, thus: "Of beauty it has not a trace; the picturing is even uncouth and repulsive. It is the enormous force, the rude strength and power of the imagery, the depth of light and shadow, that charm the critical as well as the ingenious reader." But the sonnets, "imperfect as they are, have given the ideal of the English meditative sonnet, as distinguished from the Italian. The sonnet of Shakespeare is our own; the model of a peculiar style, congenial to a proud and melancholy race. More than all other verse it expresses that profound love passion, which has no gallantry in its nature, but is as serious as life itself."

WESTFALL calls attention (pp. 272 f.) to an article on "The Sonnets of Sh." (reprinted from the *Westminster Review*) in the *Eclectic Magazine*, 1857 (XLII, 175-186), to IGNATIUS DONNELLY's pamphlet, *The Sonnets of Sh.*, 1859, and to W. R. ALGER's enthusiastic discussion of the sonnets and friendship in the *Christian Examiner*, 1862 (LXXIII, 209-226, 403-435). In the first of these (p. 185) the old whipping-boy turned up again ("We wonder what Steevens's idea of an Act of Parliament was—that it perhaps could give a feeling heart and a poetic mind, and the seeing eye"), and the case for Pembroke and Daniel as sonnet personages was stated. Donnelly, afterwards to distinguish himself as a Baconian, soberly discussed Sh.'s friend, the rival poet, and related subjects, and said (p. 4), "To no work of the English literature can we turn with more various or more delightful emotions than to these sonnets." Alger expressed great admiration (p. 210) for "the amber of his [Sh.'s] Sonnets, where the final generation of men may gaze on them with unspent astonishment," for "these matchless compositions." But, defying the plain evidence of editions and sales (pp. 403 f.), he declared that "to most readers the Sonnets . . . have been a sealed and neglected book," that their "unparalleled worth and beauty" have been able to attract few readers of any sort, and that what interest they have earned is "more controversial or factitious than intrinsic." One important reader, at any rate, cared more for the poetry than the supposed revelations of Sh.'s lyrics. In 1863, learning that his Boston friend, J. T. FIELDS, was planning to publish a new edition, J. R. LOWELL (*Letters*, 1894, I, 328-332) sent a long letter of advice. Lowell had read the sonnets with alert eyes, and had found "many passages . . . quite beyond my comprehension." But none of his proposed textual emendations was adopted by the conservative Fields edition of 1864.

WESTFALL (p. 296) observes that seven new editions of Sh.'s works, "not

to mention numerous reprints, were published during the years 1860 to 1865 while the nation was at war." He might have added that the Civil War actually encouraged Northern cranks and other persons with special revelations to print outbursts on Sh. and the sonnets. Thus in 1863 LIZZIE DOTEN issued her *Poems from the Inner Life*, a collection (p. xix) of "spiritual poems," including "two purporting to come from Shakspeare."¹ "This influence," Lizzie moans, "seemed to overwhelm and crush me. I was afraid, and shrank from it," with the result that no more numbers, no sonnets at all, came. "I do not think," she says modestly, "that the [two] poems in themselves come up to the production of his master mind," yet "I have no doubt that time will yet furnish one upon whom his mantle will fall." Just as the war ended, E. A. HITCHCOCK, a Federal army officer, reprinted "those exquisitely beautiful, but still more wonderful Sonnets" (p. 8) as an appendix to his queer discussion (*Remarks*, 1865: see p. 157, above) of them as "hermetic" writings. KARL KNORTZ (*Sh. in Amerika*, 1882, p. 22) justly observes that Hitchcock attempted "to make the English dramatist into a Swedenborgian"; but enough readers were interested in the attempt to warrant a second, enlarged, edition in 1867.

A year later T. D. BUDD, of Philadelphia, published the sonnets "with Commentaries"—a very strange book for a war-weary public. He was so obsessed with Sh.'s "Rose"—the poet's "soul materialized"—that a dazed reader may well tremble lest the Rose will shut and be a Budd again. None the less, he deserves mention because of his insistence (p. 17), unusual for the date, that the sonnets are worthy to rank with the plays: "In his dramatic productions the author delineates historic, human, and national characteristics. These have heretofore constituted the foundation of his fame. In his Sonnets he describes himself, and demonstrates the possible attainments of mankind. It is here claimed that his Sonnets are of equal merit with his greatest dramatic productions."

R. G. WHITE's edition of Sh., the best that had been made in America, spanned the Civil War. Eleven volumes were published in 1857, 1859, and 1861, while a twelfth (called the first), containing the poems and sonnets, appeared in 1865. "Here," he ended, "is my peace-offering." With White American Shakespearean study had come of age. Yet if one can believe C. C. L.'s statement (*Brunonian*, III, 150), in 1870 "the beauty of Shakespeare's *poems*" was almost "lost in the glory of his divine dramas. And yet, among this neglected class of his writings are passages as large and various in their signification, as fraught with lofty thoughts, and as redolent with hidden beauties, as the deepest lines of *Hamlet*, or the sweetest strains of *Romeo and Juliet*." He insisted that Sh.'s "beautiful sonnets," of which he gave a very enthusiastic eulogy, "are not less valuable than his divine comedies and tragedies." Shortly afterward, the first course in Sh. was given at Harvard during 1872-1873. "The presence of Shakespeare in the modern college curriculum," SIMON (*Reading of Sh.*, 1932, p. 80) writes, "may be accounted for and described through the work of one man more than any other, . . . Francis James Child [1825-1896] of Harvard," but there is no evidence that this

¹ In this connection see Sarah Shatford, p. 239, above.

famous scholar paid any attention to the sonnets or even to all the plays. But, lecturing in 1879-1880 to Johns Hopkins audiences, SIDNEY LANIER (*Sh. and His Forerunners*, 1902, I, 255) gave attention and praise to "these incomparable poems." The enormously popular lecturer, R. H. STODDARD (*Scribner's Monthly*, 1881, XXII, 913, 921), held other ideas. After paying the customary insult to STEEVENS and indulging in some vague compliments about Sh.'s lyrics, he destroyed the effect by saying that Mrs. Browning "has surpassed her English and Italian masters," and that Sh.'s sonnets, "magnificent as they are, should be read before, and not after . . . [hers], to be fully enjoyed."

Although increasing attention was paid to the sonnets by editors, commentators, and critics (KATE HILLARD, for example, published a well-informed article about "these wonderful poems" in *Lippincott's*, 1875, XV, 497-506), as late as 1888 (*Overland Monthly*, XI, 248) the veteran scholar HORACE DAVIS felt justified in prefacing his eulogy with the assertion, "Everybody reads Shakspeare's plays, but very few are familiar with his sonnets."

One great celebrity who was familiar spoke his mind to HORACE TRAUBEL (*With Walt Whitman*, 1914, III, 83 f.) just a few months later. WHITMAN disliked the "lush, polish, ornateness, elegance" of Keats's work, which suggested "Shakespeare's Sonnets, not the Greek: you know, the Sonnets are Keats and more—all Keats was then a vast sum added. For superb finish, style, beauty, I know of nothing in all literature to come up to these Sonnets: they have been a great worry to the fellows: and to me, too: a puzzle: the Sonnets being of one character, the Plays of another." Whitman then spoke of the movement, action, energy of Sh.'s dramas. In contrast, "the Sonnets are all that is opposite—perfect of their kind—exquisite, sweet: lush: eleganted: refined and refined then again refined—again: refinement multiplied by refinement. . . . [In them] vigor was not called for: they are personal: more or less of small affairs: they do their own work in their own way: that's all we could ask and more than most of us do, I suppose. . . . [The plays] are tremendous with the virility . . . so totally absent from the Sonnets."

As time went on, American collectors of Shakespeareana outdistanced the rest of the world, so that students are now obliged to journey to Boston, Cambridge, Philadelphia, Ann Arbor, Chicago, San Marino, and Washington, as well as to London, Birmingham, Cambridge, and Oxford. Critics and scholars have turned out words equal in quantity, and no doubt in quality, to those that have poured from the Old World. Editors have multiplied. H. R. STEEVES (in Matthews and Thorndike, *Shakspearian Studies*, 1916, p. 368) remarks that "Americans have contributed a tangible something to the modern conception of Shakspeare scholarship, and . . . such men as White and Furness have been of the first importance. We can say, at least, that American editors have left little for their successors to deplore." But that judgment is now too restrained, one feels, for the important work of such students and editors of the sonnets as J. Q. ADAMS, R. M. ALDEN, TUCKER BROOKE, and G. L. KIT-TREDGE.

Nobody can say how popular the sonnets are in America today. In 1912 G. H. PALMER (*Intimations*, pp. 7 f.) told of having committed eighty of them to memory and of believing that "no other body of poetry in the language is so precious for internal possession." They are, he admitted, overshadowed in

general estimation by the dramas, "yet the wise ones know, and a small band addicted to the Sonnets makes a hushed company of almost religious devotees." I see no reason to believe that this "small band" has had any significant increase in size since 1912, despite the thousands of high-school and college students who in survey courses have been exposed to infection.¹ SIMON (*Reading of Sh.*, 1932, p. 147) is still more pessimistic. Noting that except "in some strictly technical or commercial schools, there is yet probably no secondary school curriculum that does not require some reading of Shakespeare," he predicts that a change is imminent, that "fifty years hence . . . Shakespeare will have the same place he held a century ago, and only the Lowells and the Longfellows among the undergraduates will have heard of him"—a sad day for the textbook makers.

Nor has it been unfashionable to attack the sonnets. One hardy reviewer, W. V. BYARS (Reedy's *Mirror*, March 28, 1913, pp. 4-6), for instance, asserts that in Acheson's books "nearly . . . everything he writes about the sonnets is better worth reading than nearly, if not quite everything, in the Sonnets themselves." No comment could well be more damning, but Byars goes on to ridicule Sh.'s obscure, euphuistic style, in which he can find little meaning, and to say that not one of the sonnets is "worthy of the author of *Hamlet*." CHRISTOPHER MORLEY (*John Mistletoe*, 1931, p. 178) tells that one of the "japes in which he took the greatest pleasure was having (years afterward

¹ Readings of the sonnets have frequently been recorded in America by actors and elocutionists. The following, supplied by CLAUDE M. SIMPSON, JR., is a fairly inclusive list: JOHN GIELGUD, 18, 73 (*The Voice of Poetry*, volume II, Columbia M-419); MARJORIE GULLAN, 116 (*Spoken Poems of Marjorie Gullan*, Halligan Studios, New York); EDITH WYNNE MATTHISON, 18, 29 (*The Spoken Word*, Language Service Center, New York); BASIL RATHBONE, 29 (*Great Themes in Poetry*, Columbia E-11); CORNELIA OTIS SKINNER, 18, 29 (*Anthology of English Lyric Verse*, Victor M-810); ROBERT SPEAIGHT, 106, 107, 129 (Harvard Vocabulum L-1002). Note also the following English recordings: EDITH EVANS, 30, 104, 116 (*The Voice of Poetry*, volume I, Columbia M-375); JOHN GIELGUD, 18, 116 (Linguaphone EEG 35, EEG 29); CLIFFORD TURNER, 30 (His Master's Voice B-3151); IDA C. WARD, 18 (English Speech Series 76431-B). OTTO SCHOEN-RENÉ adds that on five records made at intervals from 1934 to 1937 by John Knight, Wesley Abbey, and two unannounced readers for the AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR THE BLIND, the following sonnets (130 and 150 twice) occur ("Isabelle Archer Dyer Memorial Record Talking Book *Solely for the Use of the Blind* Provided by the U. S. Government through The Library of Congress"): 1-15, 18, 19, 24, 27, 29-31, 33, 40, 49, 53-55, 59-61, 64-66, 70, 71, 73, 75, 87, 90, 94, 97, 98, 102, 104, 106, 107, 116, 127, 129-132, 137-139, 141, 144, 146-150, 153. Possibly, too, book titles (see p. 366 n., above) chosen from the sonnets indicate growing popularity. Twenty-one (not all American) are listed by TANNENBAUM, 1940, nos. 421-440. Among others one might add WILLIAM POEL's *Lillies That Fester*, 1906, WITTER BYNNER's *Against the Cold*, 1940, and BEATRICE KEEN SEYMOUR's *Fool of Time*, 1941.

[when he had left the staff of Doubleday, Page, and Company], piqued by some harmless dispute with the literary staff) submitted . . . [Sh.'s] very sonnets, carefully typed out and under an alias; and received a letter saying they did not seem to be up to the literary standard of the house." Retelling this anecdote in 1936 (Sh.'s *Complete Works*, pp. xi f.), he expresses approval of Palmer's judgment, but somewhat spoils the effect by calling "the later" sonnets "abominations of carnal vulgarity or an actual madness of mockery" and the last two "what seems a realtor's testimonial for the town of Bath." J. C. RANSOM (*World's Body*, 1938: see pp. 432-434, below) is only one of numerous other contemporary critics who enjoy, like STEEVENS a century and a half ago, "throwing a few stones" (p. 270) at them; and he takes apparent pleasure in observing (pp. 273, 278, 284) that "generally they are ill constructed," "Shakespeare is a careless workman," the "perfect sonnets are not many." Replying to Ransom's comments, ARTHUR MIZENER (*Southern Review*, 1940, V, 733: see also p. 436, below) feels obliged to concede that "probably a great many more people than profess to would dislike . . . [Sh.'s sonnet poetry] were they not bullied into accepting it by Shakespeare's name." Equally modern and more "modernistic," MARJORY B. PRATT furnishes *Formal Designs from Ten Sh. Sonnets* (Brooklyn, 1940) which may—or may not—add to one's appreciation and understanding of Sh.'s verse.

American critics not infrequently raise the old war cry against sonnets as sonnets. DAVID MORTON (*New York Times Book Review*, December 14, 1941, p. 18) laments: "This charge against poetry in the sonnet form—that it negatives the style of the individual writer—is heard in various quarters, in these times when the personal accent is so avidly sought. But it is a mistake to suppose . . . that this is necessarily and universally true." The bloodless battle against sonnets may never end. As for Sh.'s, perhaps the most surprising (and practical) example of their power in America is to be found in the case of the actress, HELEN HAYES. At the age of eighteen she was in rehearsal for a part in Barrie's *Dear Brutus*. The director, an Englishman, continually criticized her southern accent, and she was about to withdraw in despair. But according to her mother, CATHERINE H. BROWN (*Letters to Mary*, 1940, p. 114), the director "suggested that she read Shakespeare's sonnets aloud. We bought a copy on our way home that day and for days and days and nights and nights we had sonnets instead of conversation." Miss Hayes's "diction improved," she made a great hit, and thus was launched on her career of "first lady" of the American stage.

GERMANY

Adequately to trace the vogue of the sonnets in foreign countries would be to write a book enormous in bulk. As in Great Britain and America, editions (or translations) have been issued in an unceasing stream in Germany, France, and elsewhere, though many have little value, little or no excuse for being. A glance at such general discussions of Sh. and the Continent as those of J. G. ROBERTSON and C. H. HERFORD, or at such catalogs as SHAW's of the Birmingham Sh. library, shows that the sonnets have surpassed the other poems in popularity but have been largely overshadowed by the plays. The same conclusion is reenforced by specialized studies, like COLLISON-MORLEY's and NULLI's on Sh. in Italy; RUBOW's and RUUD's on Sh. in Norway and

Denmark; L. M. PRICE's and KAHN's on Sh. in Germany; MARTÍNEZ's and PAR's on Sh. in Spain; CALINA's on Sh. in Poland; C. M. HAINES's and DUBUEUX's on Sh. in France; POPOVIC's on Sh. in Serbia; and PENNINK's on Sh. in Holland. According to J. G. ROBERTSON (*M. L. R.*, 1906, I, 312-321), Sh. was first mentioned on the Continent in a book by D. G. MORHOF (*Unterricht von der deutschen Sprache*) published at Kiel in 1682, and again in France during 1686 and Italy in 1726.

In Germany most of the early translations were confined to the plays, as those of J. J. ESCHENBURG (Strassburg and Mannheim, 1778-1783), A. W. VON SCHLEGEL (Berlin, 1797-1810), J. W. O. BENDA (Leipzig, 1825, 1826), and LUDWIG TIECK (Berlin, 1825-1833). Yet these men had read the sonnets, and at least three of them may be called directly responsible for the translations, critical essays, and scholarly studies that have since inundated Germany. Surprisingly enough, *Venus* and *Lucrece* were translated by H. C. ALBRECHT in 1783. But as W. I. LUCAS (*Die epischen Dichtungen Sh.s in Deutschland*, 1934, p. 101) remarks, "Though the sonnets became known and translated much later, interest in them was considerably more lively and active in the course of the nineteenth century."

In *Ueber W. Sh.*, 1787, ESCHENBURG atoned for his earlier omissions by devoting a long final chapter to all the Sh. poems, and by printing both the English and German prose versions of fifty-six sonnets.¹ He used Malone (ed. 1780) as the basis for his English text, which is full of errors, many perhaps chargeable to the printer. He had no first-hand knowledge of Q, and his comments are extremely curious (pp. 525 f.): "The earliest collection" of *all* Sh.'s poems, "some of which had been printed separately during the author's lifetime, first appeared after his death, in the year 1640, in London, published in octavo by Thomas Cotes and John Benson." In a footnote (p. 526 n.) he mentions "an edition of [all] these poems in 1609, quarto, announced as the first" in the Johnson-Steevens Sh. of 1778 (I, 240), only to say: "This is probably an error, for there is no mention of it elsewhere. On the contrary, because these poems did not appear during the poet's lifetime some critics have, though on insufficient evidence, doubted their authenticity." Yet on page 574 he quotes from the dedication of Q, and seemingly has no doubts about the date 1609 for the sonnets. All of which is merely another indication of the confusion caused by the 1640 text.

In his critical appraisal of the sonnets ESCHENBURG was a mere follower of Malone and Steevens. None the less, his pronouncements for some years had echoes in Germany. Sh., he declares (pp. 524 f.), "has hitherto been best known to his countrymen as well as to intelligent foreigners as a playwright. Only a few in both groups know him as the author of other poems, for the very natural reason that, as such, he less deserves to be known. A single one of his best plays, a *Hamlet*, an *Othello*, would have been sufficient to assure him immortality, whereas through the whole collection of his other poems he could hardly have hoped to remain famous down to our days. . . . In a comparison

¹ 2, 5, 8, 11, 12, 18, 19, 21, 23, 27, 29, 30, 32, 37, 39, 42, 47, 52, 54, 59, 60, 63, 66, 70, 71, 73, 75, 76, 79, 86, 89, 90, 93, 94, 96-99, 102, 104, 106, 112, 114, 119, 126-128, 130, 138, 140, 143, 145, 147-149, 154.

of their value with the inner content of his plays Shakspeare's poems, large and small, lose greatly, although, on the other hand, for the lovers of poetry and the admirers in particular of this great poet they have a relatively high value because they are, none the less, products of so extraordinary a genius." Again (pp. 571 f.), "Mr. Steevens correctly says that the sonnet was without doubt the invention of some literary Procrustes. The single thought of which it must consist may be ever so rich and fruitful, yet it must be squeezed into fourteen lines; or it may be ever so poor and weak, yet it must be spun out into just as many verses. The whole aim is to have the links of the chain complete; the very least of the poet's worries is to please thereby the mind and the heart. It cannot be denied, however, that there are many admirable sonnets, for, when art and genius work in common with chance, the latter may sometimes indeed perform miracles." The "greatest fault" of the sonnets, he continues (pp. 573-575), seems to be "a lack of variety and the fact that most are addressed to a man and not to a woman, for whom such warm and tender expressions of esteem and devotion . . . would unquestionably have been more fitting. Furthermore, one finds in them many far too affected, far-fetched thoughts, but our poet's best plays are not themselves entirely free of this fault. . . . On the whole, language and versification are anything but objectionable; rather there are some exquisite lines in these poems. . . . Monotony of thought is probably the justest reproach one can make of the sonnets. It is even greater here than in Petrarch and more conspicuous since Sh. [sic] compensates us, not like that poet with feeling, but with naked, and not always very successful, wit. A large part contains exactly the same principal thought, namely, an appeal to his young friend to love and to marry; and these incitements to the conjugal bliss of life, love, and the joys of fatherhood are so urgent and are, in part, presented with such vivid warmth, that we may excuse most editors for providing these pieces with captions that allude to nothing but love, and regard most of the sonnets as addressed by a lover to his mistress."¹ In the next year ESCHENBURG (*Beispielsammlung zur Theorie und Literatur der schönen Wissenschaften*, 1788, II, 81) remarked that Sh.'s sonnets were "very uneven and on the whole not of very remarkable value."

A modern critic, HANS SCHRADER (*Eschenburg und Sh.*, 1911, pp. 35 f.), explains: ESCHENBURG felt that Sh.'s "proper field was the drama; in the realm of lyric and narrative poetry he was far less fortunate. . . . This assertion by Eschenburg must be qualified. It is valid only if we set the great value and number of his plays parallel with his lyrical productions. For in his sonnets Shakespeare is one of the greatest lyricists of his day. But he was not the great reformer in the lyric, and so as a lyricist he has not for us the significance that he has as a dramatist. I do not believe that Eschenburg means to say that Shakespeare is insignificant as a lyricist. In proof I quote . . . [Eschenburg, *Ueber W. Sh.*, 1787, p. 550]: ' . . . in Shakspeare's plays there are many and certainly very great beauties which are wholly independent of

¹ Another reference to the 1640 *Poems* and its editors. An anonymous reviewer of Eschenburg's book (*Neue Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften*, 1788, XXXV, 118) spoke of the sonnets as numbering a hundred and forty—an indication of how unfamiliar they were to German readers.

the dramatic dialog and deserve no less admiration than that dialog, in the manipulation of which he was so great a master. Narration and picturesque description were his great talent.' I believe that Eschenburg here intends to emphasize strongly the fact that Shakespeare is not to be regarded only as a great dramatist (though nearly all his contemporaries did this, first of all Lessing, who judged Shakespeare exclusively from the point of view of the drama), but in his nature as a poet in general. It would be a biased way of thinking to praise only the great dramatist in Shakespeare. Eschenburg, therefore, regarded it as a duty to acquaint his countrymen with Shakespeare the lyricist as well. . . . He is the first German to report in detail about Shakespeare as a lyricist. . . . Malone had prepared the way for him . . . and Eschenburg, in general, follows him."

Whatever the defects of ESCHENBURG's criticism, and they are small for the date at which he was writing, at least it stirred up interest in the sonnets. One of his readers, HERDER, in a letter of March 10, 1788 (Carl Schüddekopf, *Archiv für Literaturgeschichte*, 1885, XIII, 509), declared: "Your epilog to *Shakespeare* is worth its weight in gold; certainly not even the English have so compendious and mature a collection of critical ideas about him in a single volume. For us Germans the supplement to your translations is still another garland with which you crown your author. I reread, with indescribable joy, these poems, which I had read in my youth and some of which I had translated at that time very roughly into broken language." It is a pity that Herder's youthful translations have not survived.

Many other distinguished men soon turned to the sonnets, though not always with admiration. Thus in the winter of 1793-1794, TIECK wrote (*Buch über Sh.*, ed. Henry Lüdeke, 1920, pp. xxii, 177) that "in Sh. [*sic*] Sonnets, Adonis, and Lucrece this dazzling, shimmering manner in which everything consists of useless and showy tinsel is still dominant." None the less, he made great use of them for his novel, *Dichterleben*. ALBERT EICHLER (*E. S.*, 1922, LVI, 254-280) discusses that matter: Tieck (p. 268) "describes Southampton . . . as child-like, almost girlish, as a youth of gentle beauty, or, more imaginatively, gives him a 'pretty maidenly face with heavenly blue eyes' and even lets him be mistaken for a girl." Eichler (p. 280) mentions TIECK's proposed *Buch über Sh.*, part of which was actually corrected for the press. The novels *Dichterleben* and *Prolog*, he says, help to justify ADOLF BARTEL's beautiful statement (*Einführung in die Weltliteratur*, 1913, I, 650) that Tieck greatly advanced the recognition of Sh., indeed "to the very threshold of literary science."

Extremely important in their results were the comments made by A. W. VON SCHLEGEL in 1796 (*Sämmtliche Werke*, ed. Eduard Böcking, 1846, VII, 38). In support of his assertion that Sh.'s work shows such admirable traits as "masculine dignity, modest grandeur, constant and holy innocence, godlike blandness" Schlegel took care in a footnote to include the "non-dramatic poems, especially his sonnets, which were so neglected that, of all the editors of his works, Steevens and Malone were the first who thought it worth their while to mention them, the former moreover very unfavorably." He then went on to call them invaluable for their autobiographical details, and his remarks (see pp. 133-136, above) had loud repercussions in England no less than

at home. His admiration for the English poet is also shown in a sonnet of 1800 (the same, I, 337) called "Sh.'s Sonette und übrigen Jugendgedichte," which begins, "Wer Freundschaft für den Schönen konnte fühlen, Die, gleich der Lieb', in Sehnsucht oft erblasste," and in his lectures of 1808 (see p. 133, above).

Then in 1803 K. F. L. KANNEGIESSER published in the magazine *Polychorda* (I, 52-58, 115-122, 338-343, 567-570) twenty-six of the sonnets¹ translated in mixed meters. As nine of these were not in Eschenburg's 1787 translations, a total of sixty-five sonnets by Sh. was now readily available for Germans who read no English. Six others were added to the Eschenburg-Kannegiesser list when about 1819 E. F. G. O. VON DER MALSBURG (*Poetischer Nachlass*, ed. Philippine von Calenberg, 1825, pp. 68-82) translated fifteen sonnets, "An einen unvermählten Freund."²

Meanwhile in 1812 FRIEDRICH VON SCHLEGEL (*Geschichte der alten und neuen Litteratur*, 1815, II, 137 f.) had paid his respects to the sonnets:³ "The admiration of Shakspeare, who, in his lyric and idyllic poetry, followed this [Spenser's] model completely, can give Spenser a still higher value in our estimation. In this category, which to Shakspeare was true poetry, whereas he seems to regard the stage, of which he was master, only as a more ordinary employment and use of it [poetry], as if for the mob, one first becomes acquainted with the great poet according to his own mode of perception. He himself, who knows how to call forth thrillingly every depth of passion and represents common human nature as it is, in its full meanness, entirely truthfully and characteristically, he himself is so little a passionate, turbulent person, or brutal in his way, that indeed in those poems the most extreme tenderness of feeling is dominant. And just because this feeling is so sincere and so deep, and tender almost to fastidiousness, it appeals to but few. Yet these lyric works are highly important for the truest understanding of his dramatic works. They show us that in the latter he hardly ever represented what appealed to him, or what he himself was and felt, but rather the universe, as he saw it stand before him, clearly and separated by a deep abyss from himself and from his deep tenderness of feeling. Entirely accurate, without flattery and embellishment, and of incomparable truth is the world panorama which he sets up for us."

In 1820 KARL LACHMANN published at Berlin his translation, which, says ALBERT LEITZMANN (*Jahrbuch*, 1920, LVI, 76), "has the merit of being *the first complete one in German*," though actually Lachmann omitted three sonnets (135, 136, 151). Leitzmann (p. 77) quotes a letter Lachmann sent to his old teacher G. F. BENECKE on June 19, 1820: "I beg you to accept, with friendliness and indulgence, the enclosed translation of the Shakespearean sonnets. . . . You have . . . [a] right to this book . . . , for I remember clearly how I also first became acquainted with Shakespeare's sonnets through you. May you not find them deviating from the sense in too many places! I have sometimes changed the Malone text a little. I know well that much can be objected to

¹ In the order 100, 128, 154, 145, 102, 39, 60, 76; 1, 2, 7, 12, 16, 38, 79, 81; 143, 106, 104, 98, 97, 96; 9, 14, 18, 15.

² 7-10, 12, 17-19, 21-23, 25, 26, 130, 132.

³ See pp. 133 f., above.

my expression: but since Shakespeare demanded much of his readers, the same thing will be permitted to the translator. Anglomaniacs, who do not understand German, have insisted (others, to my comfort, haven't yet) that one could readily understand the translation if one had first read the English (and had not understood it, I added)." Lachmann's book attracted considerable attention, and gave reviewers an opportunity to express their notions of Sh., even when they knew him only in German. BENECKE himself (*Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1820, p. 1928) wrote: "Not only do Shakspeare's sonnets contain much that is excellent and beautiful, but they are also all that the great poet, about whom we have so little reliable information, says about himself, and moreover the best explanation of many passages in his larger works. They deserve therefore to be better known than they actually are. But here and there they are difficult and obscure, not seldom affected and cold in ideas and images, harsh and clumsy in expression."

The poet and dramatist, AUGUST, GRAF VON PLATEN-HALLERMUND, was a far less restrained admirer of the sonnets, as numerous entries in his *Tagebücher* (ed. G. von Laubmann and L. von Scheffler, 1900, volume II) demonstrate:

October 2, 1820 (p. 418): "Purchased . . . the narrative and lyrical poems of Shakespeare."

June 20, 1821 (p. 463): "I read . . . all Shakespeare's sonnets."

September 7–October 10, 1821 (p. 490): "[Borrowed from the Göttingen library] the great work of Drake: 'Shakespeare and his Times' in two quarto volumes, the best, richest that has yet appeared about the poet." (P. 491) "In Göttingen I bought . . . Lachmann's translation of Shakespeare's sonnets, to which translation Benecke had called my attention."

June 4, 1822, describing a boat-trip to Cologne (p. 527): "On the last evening I talked to one of the Englishmen about Shakespeare. . . . I had with me Shakespeare's *Sonnets*, which he, however, like most of his countrymen, did not know. He was a physician, and moreover cultured and agreeable, but he had only the customary opinion of Shakespeare, that one could draw from him a great knowledge of human nature, and so on."

June 4, 1822, in Ems (p. 528): "This evening I went walking on the lonely left bank [of the Rhine] and read Shakspeare's *Sonnets*, while from the right bank joyful music came over and accompanied the verses."

August 1, 1822, on a trip to Streitberg (p. 542): "The weather was very beautiful, and I looked at that country more than I had before. I had with me Shakespeare's 'Sonnets,' which came in very handy for me."

November 1, 1822 (p. 562): "I took a long walk today with Shakespeare's sonnets and reached Grünsberg."

As a result of his idolatry, in the summer of 1822 PLATEN wrote a eulogistic sonnet (ridiculed by HEINE in *The Baths of Lucca*, 1828, chapters 10, 11), "Sh. in seinen Sonetten," beginning,

Du ziehst bei jedem Los die beste Nummer,
Denn wer, wie du, vermag so tief zu dringen
In's tiefste Herz?

Another sonnet written at this time ("Da kaum ich je an deine Locken

streife"), RUDOLF SCHLÖSSER (*Studien zur vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte*, 1909, IX, 175 f.) asserts, all the poet's editors are embarrassed at having to reprint, for it imitates Sh.'s 128 as a tobacco pipe a spinnet.

By 1826 DOROTHEA TIECK had completed a translation of the sonnets for her father, who used twenty-six¹ of them to illustrate his article on the sonnets (*Penelope Taschenbuch*, 1826, pp. 314-339); and in the same year ERNST FLEISCHER published at Leipzig an *Appendix to Sh.'s Dramatic Works*, containing all the poems in English. Then in rapid succession appeared the translations of ANDREAS SCHUMACHER (one hundred fifty-one sonnets, 41, 85, 144 being omitted), Vienna, 1827, 1839; R. S. SCHNEIDER, Gotha, 1834; GOTTLLOB REGIS (*Sh.-Almanach*), Berlin, 1836; KARL RICHTER, Schneeberg, 1836, Leipzig, 1838, Vienna, 1839; "EMIL WAGNER" (L. R. WALESRODE), Königsberg, 1840; and ERNST ORTLEPP, Stuttgart, 1840, 1843. But readers were not always willing to endorse even the tepid judgment of LUDWIG WACHLER (*Handbuch*, 3d revised ed., 1833, III, 303), "The songs and sonnets (1609) are in part masterly." GERVINUS, for example, in 1849 (*Sh. Commentaries*, 1863, I, 633) expressed his agreement "with Cunningham and others, that the sonnets . . . , æsthetically considered, have been over-estimated."

That they were finding more and more readers, however, the new translations prove. Barely to mention the scattering examples turned into German by GERVINUS (*Shakespeare*, 1849, volume II; 3d ed., 1862, volume I), ALEXANDER BÜCHNER (*Geschichte der englischen Poesie*, 1855, volume I), O. L. HEUBNER (*English Poets*, Leipzig, 1856), FRIEDRICH BODENSTEDT (*Aus der Heimat und Fremde*, 1856, I, 215-220; 1859, II, 64-67), ROBERT ZIMMERMANN (1862, *Studien*, 1870, volume II), J. L. F. FLATHE (*Shakspeare*, 1863), and ALEXANDER NEIDHARDT (*Archiv*, 1865, XXXVIII, 381-390), complete translations—some of which went through various editions—were made by WILHELM JORDAN, Berlin, 1861; FRIEDRICH BODENSTEDT, Berlin, 1862, 1866; KARL SIMROCK, Stuttgart, 1867; F. A. GELBCKE, Hildburghausen, 1867; HERMANN, FREIHERR VON FRIESEN, Dresden, 1869; ALEXANDER NEIDHARDT, Berlin, 1870; BENNO TSCHISCHWITZ, Halle, 1870. Like their English brethren, these men often posed as being more or less pioneers. JORDAN (p. viii) asserts: "Here in Germany one sometimes hears, as happened several times to me during the progress of this work, even from worshipers of the poet who are well acquainted with his plays, the wondering question: 'Did Shakespeare then, aside from his plays, also write poems?'" He admits that until a short time ago he himself knew nothing of the non-dramatic verse.

But whether in English or in German, the sonnets met with a mixed reception. GRILLPARZER, who in 1849 (*Tagebücher*, 1924, V, 200 f.) had disparaged Sh. as a poet "in the usual meaning of the word" and had condemned *Venus* and *Lucrece*, in 1852 (the same, V, 228 f.) likewise commented on "the mannerisms, the subtleties, even the coldness in his lyric and narrative poems, where it lay within his power to follow only that which he considered beauty and art." Again in 1861 (the same, 1930, VI, 53), he expressed great dislike for

¹ 8, 14, 17, 21, 127, 130, 128, 132, 60, 18, 19, 81, 98, 99, 102, 25, 33-35, 26, 54, 55, 73, 74, 71, 66. The remainder are preserved among Tieck's papers at the Preussische Staatsbibliothek.

the themes of the sonnets, and added: "One should let these sonnets alone. They can add nothing to Shakspear's fame and, interpreted most favorably, can arouse only regret. Above all, they should not be translated. Leave them to the literati, whose ostrich stomachs can digest everything." EDGAR GROSS (*Jahrbuch*, 1915, LI, 20) dismisses these and other remarks as "Grillparzer's unimportant discussions of Shakespeare's lyric and narrative art," but probably they were of some importance at the time.

The three-hundredth anniversary of Sh.'s birth in 1864 was, of course, widely celebrated, sometimes queerly, as when JULIUS STURM published at Dresden a *Stenographisches Sh.-Album*, in which four of the sonnets in shorthand are supplied from the translation of Bodenstedt. KREYSSIG, for his share, published in the *Preussische Jahrbücher* a critical article, saying (XIV, 102 f.) that "the non-erotic sonnets seem . . . to have a three-fold nature. A certain number of them show the poet as a competing imitator of contemporary sonneteers and obviously dependent upon the influence of the taste of the time, striving to cloak the praise of someone, or perhaps even of several people, possibly imaginary, in witty verses. They may well be simple poetic exercises in the sonnet form, and they owe a good part of their renown at present (excuse the heresy!) to their author's name. A second series bears unmistakably the impress of the freshest individual feeling and permits us invaluable glimpses into his inner life as well as into his relations with his contemporaries. Then there remain a number of quite remarkable poems, true pearls in mankind's poetic hoard, in which the thought soars upward beyond a specific actual or imagined impulse to the freest heights of contemplation, and the ripest fruits of the Shakspearean genius are offered in splendid bowls to the connoisseur for his healthful and refreshing enjoyment." When the *Jahrbuch* was issued in 1865 the sonnets were assured of at least such fame as heavy, academic articles could bestow. To the very first volume DELIUS, already well known as an editor of the plays and poems, contributed an essay in which he decided that Sh. himself thought the sonnets unimportant, or otherwise he would have printed them with care equal to that he bestowed on *Venus* and *Lucrece*.

BODENSTEDT, whose scheme of rearranging the sonnets (see pp. 87 f., above) met with less favor than he had expected, wrote somewhat vaguely in 1866 (Sh.'s *Sonette*, p. 201): "In a society which controlled a good part of public opinion in esthetic matters, I once heard the strangest and most depreciating judgments about Shakespeare's sonnets; they were called pedantic, foolish, crude, awkward, insipid—in short, they regarded them as spots on the sun of British poetry." Yet by 1866 the tide had turned, and the period of praise had begun.

Henceforth, an enormous flood of books, articles, and translations poured from the German press. In regard to the last, the *Magazin für die Literatur des Auslandes*, 1871 (LXXX, 520), ironically asserted: "There is scarcely a schoolmaster [in Germany] who has not at least one translation in his desk. . . . We indeed grudge no one his pleasure, but in the interests of patriotism we advise most of these gentlemen to lock the desk again." The advice was disregarded. As mere illustrations, OTTO DEVRIENT (*Zwei Sh.-Vorträge*, 1869, pp. 33-85) translated into verse twenty-one sonnets; F. A. LEO (*Gedichte*, 2d

ed., 1872, pp. 226-229), four; OTTO GUTTMANN (*Programm des Königlichen Gymnasiums zu Hirschberg*, 1875, pp. 8-15), thirty-one; H. HÄFKER (*Was sagt Sh.?*, 1896), twenty-one; ADOLF BEKK (*Shakespeare*, 1902), seven. The best-known complete translations were those made by OTTO GILDEMEISTER, Leipzig, 1871, 1876; FRITZ KRAUSS, Leipzig, 1872,¹ Weimar, 1882;² ALFRED VON MAUNTZ, Berlin, 1894; M. J. WOLFF, Berlin, 1903 (see also his *Sh.s Werke*, Berlin, 1926, volume XIX); STEFAN GEORGE, Berlin, 1909 (included in Friedrich Gundolf's *Shakespeare*, 1925, VI, 333-411); EDUARD SAENGER, Leipzig, 1909; LUDWIG FULDA, Berlin, 1913; EMIL LUDWIG, Berlin, 1923 (reissued as volume IX, 1924, of Bab and Levy's *Shakespeare*); TERESE ROBINSON, Munich, 1927; KARL HAUSER, Graz, 1929; OTTO HAUSER, Vienna, 1931; BEATRICE BARNSTORFF FRAME, Paderborn, 1931; KARL KRAUS, Vienna, 1933; RICHARD FLATTER, Vienna, 1934; and GUSTAV WOLFF, Munich, 1939. Many of these have been reprinted time after time.

In addition, various English texts of Q were reprinted, like those in the complete editions (1854-1861, 1856, 1864, 1872) of DELIUS and in the separate editions of ERNST ROWOHLT (Leipzig, 1910) and the Tauchnitz Pocket Library, No. 64, 1916; while partial German translations abound. Among the latter may be mentioned A. BALTZER, *Die schönsten Sonette von William Sh.*, 1910, with thirty-three sonnets;³ LUDWIG FULDA's *Vier Sonette*, 1912;⁴ CONRAD HAUSSMANN's "Aus Sh.s Sonetten" (*März*, 1916, X, ii, 55-57);⁵ FRIEDRICH HUCH's *Sh.: Sonette*, 1921, with thirty-three sonnets;⁶ ALBERT RITTER's *Der unbekannte Sh.*, 1922 (in which [p. 8] "the sonnets were not added in their entirety since they are so widely circulated, although for the most part in separate editions, that a new publication of them did not seem of pressing necessity"), a collection of thirty sonnets, ten⁷ by Ritter, the remainder⁸ by older translators; ERNST STEINMANN and OLGA VON GERSTFELDT's *Sh.: Fünfzig Sonette*, 1923;⁹ and WILHELM MARSCHALL's *Aus Sh.s poetischem Briefwechsel*, 1926, with thirty-five¹⁰ sonnets in a strange arrangement.

Even from this incomplete list of editions and translations one cannot resist feeling that RITTER is correct, that in Germany, as in the English-speaking

¹ *Sh.'s Southampton-Sonette* (1-56, 59-125, 133, 134, 144).

² *Sh.'s Selbstbekenntnisse* (57, 58, 126-132, 135-143, 145-154, plus a few of the sonnets in the 1872 volume).

³ 2, 5, 7, 8, 18, 23, 27, 30, 33, 34, 49-51, 60, 64-66, 69-74, 87, 91, 96, 97, 99, 107, 116, 124, 140, 149.

⁴ 66, 109, 129, 130.

⁵ 64, 66, 76.

⁶ 12, 14-19, 22, 24, 25, 27-34, 39, 41, 52, 53, 61, 73-76, 91, 97, 98, 104, 138, 154.

⁷ 1-3, 27, 44, 71, 74, 116, 119, 146.

⁸ 7, 8, 12, 20, 28, 29, 33, 45, 50, 55, 60, 64, 66, 100, 124, 129, 133, 147, 153, 154.

⁹ I have not seen this book.

¹⁰ 2, 22, 126, 104, 67, 71, 95, 121, 57, 61, 41, 33-36, 39, 76, 78-80, 82, 83, 86, 87, 91, 94, 97, 98, 111, 59, 60, 124, 125, 77, 122. There would be no point in trying to list scattering translations like those of 1, 4, and 5 made by R. A. SCHRÖDER in *Corona*, 1936, VI, 253-255.

countries, no new publication of that nature is a "pressing necessity." KRAUSS long ago remarked of his *Sh.'s Southampton-Sonette*, 1872 (p. vii): "A new translation of Shakespeare's sonnets added to those, in part so excellent, that already exist? Well, even as I am not the first whom this splendid poem forces to an attempt, so I shall not be the last." Apparently *Sh.* will always sell, and there is no reason to hope that his admirers abroad or at home will let the sonnets rest in peace.

No summary of German scholarly and critical opinion is called for here (it is treated adequately elsewhere in this volume). But a few specimens may be given of how, as in Great Britain and America, certain writers praise the sonnets to the skies, while others damn them with faint praise or no praise at all.

To STEPHAN GÄTSCHENBERGER (*Geschichte der englischen Dichtkunst*, 2d ed., 1874, p. 51) "they show that Shakespeare as a subjective poet can describe just as profound emotion as he can as an objective poet, and here he soars so near true poetry that no other poet can follow him. Everywhere there are also traces of his philosophic, meditative mind, though the sonnets are not free from the conceited style of that age." STEEVENS often serves as a sort of whipping-boy, so that his reputation is secure in Germany. ELZE (*William Sh.* [1876], 1888, p. 329), for instance, remarks: "In opposition to Steevens, it may be maintained that Shakespeare would have become immortal as the greatest English sonnet-writer, even though he had never produced anything but his 'Sonnets.'" CONRAD (*Archiv*, 1878, LIX, 257) likewise refutes STEEVENS's comments on the equality of Watson and *Sh.* as sonneteers: "Today we would say the opposite: if Shakspeare had written nothing but the sonnets, he would be able to claim at least the poetic renown of a Petrarch." K. A. LENTZNER (*Über das Sonett*, 1886, p. 46) remarks that "German and English philologists have dedicated many volumes of exhaustive studies to this difficult problem, and it is deplorable that confusing hypotheses concerning the origin and purpose of these poems have pushed into the background interest in their true greatness and positive value. The same powerful genius that made Shakespeare's dramas immortal also pervades his minor poems. This wonderful sonnet cycle, called into being by the master's bold hand without any appreciable effort, bears the impress of a poet by the grace of God. Whereas Drummond's verses show that he created them by exerting all his powers, in Shakespeare's sonnets we see his heaven-aspiring genius going far beyond the narrow confines of the form he has chosen. The strength and weakness of Shakespearean sonneteering came from *one* source: the titanic magnanimity of their creator." More moderately, BERNHARD TEN BRINK (*Five Lectures on Sh.* [1893], trans. Julia Franklin, 1895, pp. 108 f.) calls the sonnets "little masterpieces of art, like chiseled marble, so clear cut, so delicately wrought, breathing such glowing life," while KARL WEISER (*Englische Litteraturgeschichte*, 1902, p. 60) says that in beauty of form and charm of language they surpass the efforts of all other English poets in that form.

In 1903 M. J. WOLFF (*William Sh.*, p. 15) wrote, "The time has passed when a critic and sincere admirer of Shakespeare could maintain, like Steevens," that no Act of Parliament could force anyone to read the sonnets. STEEVENS uses every opportunity to vent his anger upon them: "nothing pleases him, not even the color Shakespeare has given to roses. He comments pertinently

on that passage, what have sonnets to do with botany? One would like to add, what have they to do at all with that kind of scholarship?" To ADOLF BARTELS (*Einführung in die Weltliteratur*, 1913, I, 678) "poetically the sonnets, considered as a whole, are at any rate worthy of Shakespeare: they have, to be sure, much verbal ornament, but at the same time they have as well strength of emotion, profundity of thought, vigor of expression, and euphony of language. . . . Some at least, which equal the best lyrical passages in his plays, one would not care to do without." And *Die Literatur*, 1934 (XXXVI, 671), agrees: "Shakespeare's genius, as far as language is concerned, appears in its most concentrated form in the collection of his sonnets, perhaps because he was here writing only for and about love."

Other German writers have expressed less favorable opinions. F. T. VISCHER (*Sh.-Vorträge*, 1899, I, 134) decides that Sh.'s "rimes, artfully woven together, seem always better suited to describe a feeling which has already reached a certain degree of coolness and which, therefore, in a certain sense, rides a merry and witty see-saw by itself." EICHHOFF (*Unser Sh.*, 1903, II, 99: see pp. 47 f., above) betters STEEVENS at his own game, and finds only sixteen sonnets worth attributing to Sh. "Two facts stand out clearly: the homogeneity of the sixteen jewels and the homogeneity of the majority of the remaining sonnets. The first group offers us the most glorious thing ever produced in sonnet literature; the second, the worst." To Eichhoff's camp belongs GENÉE (*William Sh.*, 1905, p. 295), who flatly asserts, "Shakespeare's sonnets can today arouse interest only as a subject for study, not pleasure." It is impossible to deny that Genée is at least partly right. Everywhere the sonnets are more studied and theorized about than read. But to one who has gone through cart-loads of German translations and treatises on Sh. it comes as something of a surprize to read in STEFAN GEORGE (*Sh. Sonnette*, 1909, p. 5: see p. 408, below) that the sonnets are held in little honor in Germany. MEINRAD HABERL (*Entwicklung des optischen . . . Sinnes bei Sh.*, 1913, pp. 21 f.), discussing Sh.'s "marked aberrations in taste," finds the sonnets full of "insipidness and stale puns"; LUDWIG WEBER (*Shakespeare*, 1914, p. 105) echoes that they are very uneven in value, that in most of them Sh. does not go beyond the conventions of sickly fashionable lyricism, and that only in a few do we hear the full-toned poetry which we expect from Sh.; and ERNST GROTH (*Beiblatt*, 1930, XLI, 137) imagines that the writer himself quickly came to regard them as "painful expectorations of conquered epochs in his life, as rhetorical, unmasculine products, 'taffata phrases.'"

In 1931 M. J. WOLFF (*E. S.*, LXVI, 116) expressed regret that HAUER had wasted "so much diligence and love" on his translation (1929) "without achieving a form which would make Sh.s [*sic*] sonnets more intelligible or more popular among German readers." To supply that deficiency FLATTER issued his version (*Sh.s Sonette*) in 1934, and it is grimly amusing to read his opening words (p. 5): "Everyone knows Shakespeare's dramas; his sonnets are still almost unknown. Astonishing as this fact has always been, it is doubly remarkable in our time." Automatically, then, STEEVENS and his proposed Act of Parliament are mentioned. Unquestionably the sonnets are difficult to understand in English, and in various German translations one reads not so much Sh. as his translator. GUSTAV WOLFF, a Swiss biologist, tackled the

problem in his translation (Sh.'s *Sonette*, 1939). "Though it is well known," he remarks oddly (p. 5), "that . . . Sh. wrote sonnets, these poems themselves have remained unknown, especially in Germany, which for all that cannot generally be accused of neglecting Shakespeare." The inaccuracy of the statement has been shown by the foregoing pages, but apparently Wolff means (like Genée in 1905) that the "problems" of the sonnets have been talked and written about to the practical extinction of interest in the poetry. Wolff made his edition, with its English and German texts (p. 8), "to offer modest aid to the furtherance" of a real understanding of the sonnets; for "often condemned by unclean prudery, welcomed by those of a certain abnormal disposition, . . . these poems have found it not entirely easy to bring about an objective understanding of the spotless purity of their human feeling and the majesty of their artistic content." Whether he succeeded is somewhat doubtful.

At any rate, FRIEDRICH GUNDOLF (*Shakespeare*, 1928, I, 467) remarks: "That we [Germans] can understand the enigmatic sonnets beyond their mere verbal meaning, penetrating into the light and shade of their content, we owe to the great poet who translated them into German: Stefan George [1909]. He has renewed their sober ardor, which is not blinded by personal pain, but observes it as the image and the law, like that eternal 'battle of man against man and beast and earth,' of which we are the spectators or the victims. George's words are the solitary booty of a spirit which is ultimate or originating, earthy but not time-bound. Not in bondage, but in mastery, Shakespeare treats the entire stock in trade of his own period. Both have in common the fervor and the tense impulsiveness of the sublime soul, be it noon, evening, or morning of the endangered world."

In *Sh.'s Sonette in Deutschland*, 1935, L. W. KAHN decides (pp. 4-6) that German interest in the sonnets has always been more biographical and historical than artistic—another example of the old and true complaint that "problems" have overshadowed "poetry." Furthermore, Sh.'s lyrics, unlike those of Petrarch, do not belong to the history of the German sonnet; and differing conceptions of them in Germany are merely differing kinds of scholarly opinions, never differences of spiritual attitude. With George and his followers (pp. 17 f.) a reaction has begun. No longer are the sonnets regarded as a work of art derived from experience, since the experience is now discovered in the work. The poet has not necessarily "lived" the sonnets, though he may well have experienced what he vouchsafes to relate. Now they do not tell what happened to the poet, but what he learned. Their story is no more the subject-matter. The battle is on against the bourgeois spirit, its dulness and its insipid smoothness.

FRANCE

France became acquainted with the sonnets much later than Germany. While Sh.'s plays were being translated as early as 1745-1748 and 1776-1782, the sonnets were ignored, and indeed "the first French examination" of them, C. M. HAINES (*Sh. in France*, 1925, p. 119) points out, was that of F.-P.-G. GUIZOT (*Œuvres complètes de Sh.*, 1821). Actually, however, the "Notice sur le choix de sonnets" (I, 147 f.) was written by AMÉDÉE PICHOT: "Shakspeare

composed more than one hundred fifty sonnets of which we shall choose only a few; we are no longer in the age when Boileau said: 'Un sonnet sans défaut vaut seul un long poëme.' This type of poetry, completely defunct in France, has regained favor in England since Bowles and Wordsworth. Among the sonnets of Shakspeare several have a very equivocal meaning and a few offer ravishing poetry. In these one finds a sweetness of sentiment which is not devoid of some affectation, but which is of interest as the natural expression of the feelings of a poet praising his love in a period when lovers often borrowed the phraseology of their most tender statements from the learning of theologians and the jargon of scholasticism." Pichot is also responsible for the prose translations of six sonnets (pp. 149-152),¹ but GUIZOT in a "Vie de Sh." (p. lx: see also Guizot, *Sh. and His Times*, 1852, p. 65) calls the sonnets "fugitive pieces which the poetic and sprightly grace of some lines would not have rescued from oblivion but for the curiosity which attaches to the slightest traces of a celebrated man."

French curiosity about the sonnets was evidently subdued. A. F. VILLEMEN (Nouveaux melangés historiques et littéraires, 1827, p. 145) knew almost nothing about them. In his essay on Sh. he speaks of the quaint style, affected sprightliness, and profusion of imagery in *Venus*, adding that exactly the same characteristics are found in "a collection of sonnets which appeared in 1596 under the title, *The Passionate Pilgrim*."² Seven years passed before "A.-L. W.-B." (LÉON DE WAILLY) testified (*Revue des deux mondes*, 1834, 3d series, IV, 679 f.) to their unmerited neglect: "I have just looked through the sonnets of Shakspeare and am astonished, I admit, by the interest of these poems, so despised today, so little known. In this rapid reading I discovered a thousand beauties of essence and of detail. It is certainly right to say that there are books which have an unhappy fate. These sonnets, for example! With the exception of a few curious amateurs, no one reads them; no one discusses them. And yet what do they lack to obtain the rank they deserve, having had a father of at least some genius?" De Wailly explains this situation on the score that "they are the younger children in the family, overshadowed by the glory of the eldest," and that, because Sh. is a dramatist, "we do not read his sonnets which would have sufficed to immortalize Mr. Smith or Mr. Brown." "If the first place [as a sonneteer] belongs to Petrarch, who dares dispute the second with Shakspeare?" As specimens of what the French have been missing he translates (pp. 684, 686 f.) 71, 130, 143 into verse.

Two years later CHATEAUBRIAND (*Œuvres complètes*, 1867, VI, 136 f.) made prose translations of 71, 73, 102, and indulged in some general criticism (see also p. 247, above) that aroused considerable notice: "There is more poetry, imagination, and melancholy in these lines than sensibility, passion, and profundity. Shakespeare loves, but he believes no more in love than he believed in anything else: for him a woman is a bird, a breeze, a flower; a thing that charms and passes. . . . He seems to have regarded life as a frivolous and

¹ 25, 29, 37, 71, 73, 102.

² Perhaps his remarks misled readers in Cincinnati, where in November, 1829, the essay was translated and printed in the *Western Monthly Review* (III, 234-252).

unoccupied hour, as a swift and sweet leisure. Poets love liberty and the muse better than their mistress. The pope offered to secularize Petrarch so that he could marry Laura. Petrarch replied to his Holiness's obliging proposition: 'I still have many sonnets to write.' Shakespeare, so tragic a spirit, drew his seriousness from his mockery, from his disdain of himself and the human species: he doubted everything; *perhaps* is a word that keeps coming back to him."

The sonnets were ignored in BENJAMIN LAROCHE's translation, 1839-1840, of the plays (with an introduction by ALEXANDRE DUMAS, the elder), but to the few already available in French E. J. DELÉCLUZE (*Dante Alighieri*, 1848, pp. 517-533) added fifteen in prose (1, 2, 7, 8, 23, 24, 34, 44-46, 64, 65, 71, 73, 74). "With all their faults," he wrote (p. 534), taking a position directly opposed to Chateaubriand's, the sonnets "would suffice to place this man [Sh.] among writers of the first rank. . . . What dominates everything in these verses,—images, sentiments, and thoughts,—is love, expressed simultaneously as spiritual and as real. Besides, Shakespeare makes in them an avowal which may serve as a commentary on his poetic reveries. 'Love is my sin,' he says (sonnet 142); and it must be admitted that if the audacity, tenderness, and strangeness in his verses is at all a faithful indication of what he experienced in real life, the malady of love held him fast." Delécluze (pp. 535 f.) was surprised by "the almost complete identity of several passages of Shakespeare's Sonnets . . . and whole phrases out of the amorous poems, and particularly the *Vita Nuova*, of Dante," and he illustrated it by passages translated from both authors.¹ Sh. he characterizes (p. 516) as a great poet, "who, in his Sonnets at least," was a worthy rival of Dante both "in genius and in obscurity."

Eight years passed before ERNEST LAFOND issued the English and French verse texts (some in the Italian, others in the Shakespearean, form) of forty-eight sonnets (Paris, 1856).² Sh.'s sonnets and poems, he writes (p. xiii), are hardly known in France and not much better in England. The poet's dramas have overshadowed his first youthful attempts, but in them he reveals himself as rich in promise, in them one may divine all that he will be. Unluckily for Lafond, F.-V. HUGO's complete prose translation, the first in France, was published at Paris in the following year (1857). It was later included in HUGO's *Œuvres complètes de Sh.*, volume XV (Paris, 1865), and still remains the standard French text. Not, however, for lack of rivals. Peculiarly enough, FRANCISQUE MICHEL (1861) included the two long narrative poems but omitted the sonnets. But all the latter appeared in the prose translation of GUIZOT, volume VIII (Paris, 1862), and ÉMILE MONTÉGUT, volume X (Paris, 1881, 1904), and in the verse translation of ALFRED COPIN (Paris, 1888).³ These

¹ See also p. 80, above.

² They are 21, 25, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 44, 45, 48, 50, 52, 55, 57, 60, 64-66, 71, 73-77, 81, 89-91, 95-99, 102, 104, 109-111, 116, 121, 128-130, 138, 143, 145, 146, 154. Judging from the book itself and from the catalog of the Bibliothèque Nationale, the edition of 1856 is the first. The British Museum catalog and TANNENBAUM, 1940, no. 248, give only the date 1836; ALDEN (ed. 1916, p. 498) gives 1836 and 1856.

³ Copin's translation was first partially published in the *Revue d'art drama-*

three versions, as well as the elder HUGO's rhapsodic *William Sh.* of 1864, created and sustained interest in the English sonneteer. AUGUSTIN FILON in 1883 (*Histoire de la littérature anglaise*, pp. 186 f.), however, spoke of "the equivocal outbursts" of the sonnets, of their infantile amorous casuistry; they are "vague, mournful, and humble, the residue of a soured ambrosia remaining in the bottom of the poet's cup on the morning after an orgy."

In 1891 SIMONE ARNAUD contributed to *La Nouvelle revue* (LXXI, 537-555) translations of twenty-four sonnets,¹ keeping the Shakespearean rime scheme, and FERNAND HENRY published a complete translation at Paris in 1900. The latter used, in general, the Petrarchan form, in the hope that it would seem less strange to French readers than Sh.'s, and printed the English text of each sonnet below its French equivalent. The subject-matter (p. vi) frankly appalled him. The first impression which the sonnets make upon a reader is "complex. One is at the same time overcome by the incomparable splendor of the form and disconcerted by the strangeness of the subjects, so different from the customs of poetry, from which Shakspeare has drawn his inspiration. And as soon as one knows that the person who is celebrated by the poet, whose beauty he exalts in eulogies which strain the ultimate resources of hyperbole, upon whom he lavishes the tenderest epithets, at whose feet he prostrates himself like a slave, that this person, I say, is a man, one stops being astonished, one is frankly shocked, and, for a moment, admiration hesitates, prepared to recoil." Such criticism from a Frenchman of 1900 sounds strange, but it must have drawn readers to the immoral English poet.

C.-M. GARNIER's "Sonnets de Sh., essai d'une interprétation en vers français," first appeared in 1906 and 1907 in *Cahiers de la quinzaine* (8th series, nos. 7 and 15). The two sonnets (153, 154) there omitted were supplied by Garnier when his translation was included as a separate volume in A. Koszul's *Collection Sh.*, 1922. Other translations deserving mention² are F. ROGER-CORNAZ's (Paris, 1920); EMILE LE BRUN's, with an introduction by VALÉRY LARBAUD (Paris, 1927), and EDMOND L'HOMMÉDÉ's (*Secret de Sh.*, Paris, 1932). In *Sonnets d'Angleterre*, 1931 (pp. 64-83), LUCE CLARENCE printed the English texts of ten sonnets (29, 46, 64, 65, 71, 94, 116, 123, 146, 148) facing French versions. He speaks favorably (p. 13) of the English sonnet form: Sh., unlike

tique, 1887, VIII, 275-283 (sonnets 135, 136, 143, 145, 128, 139, 140, 127, 131, 132, 130, 21, 149, 137, 138, 147, 148, 141, 150), 1888, IX, 286-294 (sonnets 73, 29, 30, 111, 112, 1-3, 5, 7, 107, 123, 124, 32, 55, 108).

¹ Her order is 7, 12, 2, 18, 19, 104, 50, 98, 30, 31, 29, 66, 89, 90, 71, 73, 74, 109-112, 119, 120, 116. I have not seen the 1891 French translation of LOUIS DIREY, published at Poverty Bay, New Zealand. AUGUSTIN FILON (*Revue des deux mondes*, 1901, 5th series, II, 795) mentions it only as a "curiosity. . . . The style is no less bizarre or unexpected than the place from which it comes to us: I know nothing more decadent in decadence, nor more unintelligible in gibberish."

² I have been unable to see ABEL DOYSIÉ, *Les Poèmes intimes et le Pèlerin Passionné*, Paris, 1919. There have, of course, been many partial translations, like that of 29-31, 52, 56, 71 in LEGOUIS's *Dans les sentiers de la renaissance anglaise*, 1925, pp. 50-55. See also the introductions to 20, 31, and 116.

Petrarch, did not seek sonority and warmth of color, but "pensive sweetness." He sensed what could be artificial in the Italian sonnet, which has often replaced passionate movement with elegant and ingenious phrases and with wit—with witticism. The Shakespearean sonnet can carry the greatest sweetness known to English versification. Following the three decasyllabic quatrains, the distich, which concludes the sonnet, is not so far from the first line but that it can preserve the strength of unity, nor so near as to break the chain of this tender movement. It is sufficiently near the first verse to let its influence permeate the whole poem. Not least of the charms of a Shakespearean sonnet is the feeling evoked by the expectation of a change in rhythm.

From 1821 to date the sonnets have been held steadily before the eyes of French readers, some of whom, like the poet FRANCIS JAMMES, may have been depressed by their "funereal melancholy." "Je vois volontiers chacun de ces sonnets," Jammes wrote (Garnier, Sh.'s *Sonnets*, 1922, pp. xxi f.), "comme un mausolée blanc élevé sur une terre maudite et entouré de narcisses suspects." And if the French have written fewer studies and evolved fewer theories than Germans, Americans, and Britons, who will blame them for their forbearance? C. M. HAINES asserted in 1925 (*Sh. in France*, p. 161) that Sh. "is better known in France than any French author is in England." Sh.'s sonnets are unquestionably better known in France than any French sonneteer's are known in Great Britain or America, and possibly they will become even more familiar when the translation, with commentary, of FERNAND BALDENSPERGER (*Work in Progress* 1939, no. 709) finally appears.

ITALY

The sonnets were slow in penetrating Italy. Occasionally men of letters in the middle decades of the nineteenth century, with their curiosity aroused by the eulogies of French or German critics and editors, paid them some attention. Thus GIACOMO PINCHERLE, "private linguist," published at Trieste, 1864, "under the auspices of Shakespeare's tercentenary birth," *Ricordo a Sh.*, fifty sonnets in English. "Thy Poems ravish!" he apostrophizes the English bard (p. 3), but no such praise can be given to his own lyrics, which (p. 53) "love to Shakespeare" caused him to print—

not vain pride, to domineer
From Mount Parnassus—I as volunteer
Have but climbed it up, with no claim and rate:—
Who, if erred, erred—to grow a "*Sonnetteer!*"

Here and in two later collections of English sonnets Pincherle's subjects are as barbarous as his verse. Yet he may have directed the attention of some Italian readers to Sh.'s lyrics, all the more so because among the English sonnets that make up *In Memoria di Meyerbeer* (Trieste, 1867) he inserted (p. 23) a translation of 17, beginning "Chi al verso mio creder potrà in futuro?" Again, GIOSUÈ CARDUCCI, in "Al sonetto," 1865 (*Rime nuove*, ed. Demetrio Ferrari, 1928, p. 23), ranked Sh. as a sonneteer with Dante, Petrarch, Tasso, Michelangelo, Milton, and Camoens, commenting in the fashion of Wordsworth on the mysterious sorrows of the English Aeschylus—"A l'Eschil poi che su l'Avon rinacque, Tu, peregrin con l'arte a strania arena, Fosti d'arcan

dolori arcan richiamo." But Italian scholars and critics have generally been content to reproduce the views of other writers, mainly English, rather than to attempt to set forth new facts or original theories. An unfortunate introduction was made in 1875 by A. R. LEVI (*Studi su Sh.*), whose acquaintance both with Sh.'s lyrics and the scholarship and criticism already swamping them was elementary in the extreme. But possibly he interested a few Italian readers by describing the sonnets (p. 28) as autobiographical documents that ought to throw light on "Alice, already dear to the poet," whom Southampton stole away. Alice turns up again, Levi suggested, in Hamlet's phrase about woman's frailty, but he gave no further details.

Sh.'s lyrics were more satisfactorily reintroduced to Italian readers by GUSTAVO TIRINELLI (*Nuova antologia*, 1878, 2d series, VIII, 228-259), who summarized pretty well the various problems connected with Q and gave translations or paraphrases, wholly or partially, of more than fifty sonnets. Much later ANGELO OLIVIERI made a complete prose translation, *I sonetti di William Sh.* (Palermo, 1890), the first in Italy, basing most of his introduction on Dowden. He was instigated (p. ix) by a desire to put Italy in the same favored position as Germany, France, Holland, and other countries whose citizens could read the sonnets in their respective native languages; and (p. xii) "his own modest opinion" about his originals was "diametrically opposed to that of Steevens and very different from that of Hallam." But when GIUSEPPE CHIARINI published in the same year his articles (*Nuova antologia*, 3d series, 1890, XXVI, 5-33, 438-462, XXVII, 112-139)¹ on Sh.'s treatment of love and friendship, he commented harshly (pp. 453 f.) on Olivieri's work. A prose translation of the sonnets is, he admitted, perhaps more difficult than a verse translation,² but Olivieri lacked not only the intuition and poetic feeling necessary for an understanding of Sh.'s subtleties but also a "sure mastery of the Italian tongue" itself.³ Admitting (pp. 119 f.) that Sh.'s Italian audience is small, Chiarini gave a depressing account (pp. 452 f.) of Sh. scholarship and appreciation: he could find only one poor general commentary (Levi's), one study of the sonnets (Tirinelli's), and about ten journalistic articles, "if indeed there are so many," published during the thirty years preceding. The date at which he wrote prevented his seeing GUSTAVO STRAFFORELLO's fairly adequate chapter on the sonnets (*Curiosità ed amenità*, 1889, pp. 164-168).

LUIGI DE MARCHI's *Sonetti di Sh.* was published at Milan, 1891. In the course of a long discussion of the problems raised by Q, he translates some two dozen of the sonnets into verse and gives prose translations or paraphrases, partial or complete, of a number of others. Shortly afterward, THOMAS NEAL (*Marzocco*, December 19, 1897, p. 3) announced that "some years ago" he had made translations of "the greater part" of the sonnets (critical studies of which he aptly characterized as torches giving "more smoke than light"), but apparently he held them back from the press. Then just while LEVI (*Storia della letteratura inglese*, 1898, I, 443), a belated disciple of STEEVENS, was announcing his decision that Sh.'s sonnets are "neither better nor worse" than

¹ Included also in his *Studi Shakespeariani*, 1897.

² He himself translates a number into prose.

³ LEVI (*Storia della letteratura inglese*, 1898, I, 439 f. n.) describes it with much the same tartness.

those of Watson, Daniel, and Drayton, ETTORE SANFELICE was issuing at Velletri, 1898, *I 154 sonetti di Guglielmo Sh.*, a verse translation except for a few punning sonnets that demanded prose. In his introduction he disclaims originality and cites Dowden, Tyler, Hugo, and others as his guides; but (as I have shown elsewhere) he did manage to evolve a few independent views of his own. Sanfelice's introductory comments appeared also, with a few changes and additions, in *Rivista d'Italia*, 1898 (III, 286-317).

Passing years brought to Italy a slightly greater interest in the sonnets. They were discussed at some length in FEDERICO GARLANDA's *Guglielmo Sh.*, 1900 (pp. 257-291), and PETER BORGHESI's *Petrarch and His Influence*, 1906 (pp. 106-113), and incidentally by IRENE ZOCCO (*Petrarchismo*, 1906) and ANNA BENEDETTI (*Shakespeare*, 1916); while further translations were made by LUCIFERO DARCHINI (Milan, 1909), ADOLFO MABELLINI (Bologna, 1913),¹ and PIERO PADULLI (Lecco, 1924, 1932).² The philosopher BENEDETTO CROCE (*Ariosto, Sh. and Corneille*, 1920, pp. 193 f.) praised the sonnets for "their pensiveness, their exquisite moral tone, their wealth of psychological allusions, in which we often recognise the poet of the great plays"; but he added "that the soul of Shakespeare, poured into a fixed and therefore inadequate mould, his lyrical impulse confined to the epigrammatic, cause the poetry to flow together there, but deny to it complete expansion and unfolding." Croce likewise (pp. 122 f.) had a low opinion of the various theories about the sonnet personages, all "equally incapable of nourishing the mind." Excellent studies of the sonnets were printed by MARIO PRAZ in various articles (cited elsewhere) and in his *Storia della letteratura inglese*, 1937 (pp. 81-84). In the latter year, too, NAPOLEONE ORSINI (*William Sh.: Liriche*) adequately summarized (pp. 13-17) scholarly opinion on the sonnets, and gave (pp. 51-76) the English texts of fifteen with elaborate annotations. But, unhappily, this brief sketch must end on a sour note. ALFREDO MICHELAGNOLI (*Sonetto nella letteratura inglese*, 1938, pp. 7-11) provides some startling misinformation (see pp. 246 f., above), and indeed reveals greater unfamiliarity with Sh.'s work and his critics than Levi had shown in 1875—nowhere more than in saying (p. 10) that most critics have judiciously confined themselves "to a pure and simple apologetic exegesis," a state of affairs summarized by Longfellow's verse, "A happy Poet! by no critic vext!" Michelagnoli appears to have read no Italian, much less any modern English, French, or German, edition of these endlessly criticized lyrics.³

¹ I have not seen Mabellini's *Sh. I poemetti*. According to the *Rivista d'Italia*, 1913, XVI, ii, 639, it contains the "five youthful works of the great English writer."

² GUIDO BIAGI (*Bollettino d'arte*, 1926, 2d series, V, 513-521) describes a beautiful manuscript, *Sh.'s Sonnets Illuminated* by NESTORE LEONI, that was prepared for the 1916 Sh. celebration in London. He also reproduces four of its sonnet-pages and its portraits of Southampton and the queen.

³ Since the foregoing sketch was written J. G. FUCILLA has smoothed the paths of English and Italian students by his bibliography, "Sh. in Italian Criticism" (*P. Q.*, 1941, XX, 559-572).

OTHER FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The vogue of the sonnets elsewhere must be indicated briefly with reference primarily to the outstanding translations. The first important DUTCH critical appreciation¹ of the sonnets as poetry, that of A. S. KOK (*De Gids*, 1859, XXIII, i, 252-268), was accompanied by translations of eleven (17-19, 29, 33, 54, 60, 65, 66, 100, 109). Some twenty years later T. J. I. ARNOLD's "Sh., in de Nederlandsche Letterkunde" (*Bibliographische Adversaria*, 1878-1882, IV, 97-132) gave evidence, mainly by the citation of Dutch reviews, that the sonnets and their problems were becoming fairly familiar. Then all were turned into Dutch by L. A. J. BURGERSDIJK (Utrecht, 1879), who followed the rearrangement of Bodenstedt; but in *De Werken van William Sh.* (Leyden, 1884-1888, XII, 117-194; 3d ed., 1898, II, 805-824) he returned to that of Q. Mrs. H. MOULIJN-HAITSMA MULIER issued at Bussum in 1923 her translation of *Sh., 50 Sonnetten*. WILLEM KLOOS (*De Nieuwe Gids*, 1923, XXXVIII, ii, 281-287) in a review of her work declared that sonnets in general were unpopular in Holland, Sh.'s in particular almost untranslatable into Dutch. The same writer, however (the same, 1928, XLIII, i, 698-708), praised the *Dertig Sonnetten van Sh.* of J. DECROOS (Antwerp, 1927), while again insisting that Sh. is an enigma as a man and a sonneteer. DECROOS's complete Dutch version (Courtray, 1933) follows the order of Bray (ed. 1925) and has notes based on Tucker (ed. 1924). Another Dutch translation, ALBERT VERWEY's, appeared at Santpoort in 1933.

Critical and scholarly articles on the sonnets abound in Holland as nearly everywhere else. For example, the poet VERWEY in 1886 (*De Nieuwe Gids*, I, 61-96) discussed them at length, paying attention to bibliography, to the work of Delius and Burgersdijk, and to the technique and esthetic merits of Sh. The question whether VONDEL, the greatest Dutch poet, imitated Sh.'s sonnets has aroused considerable discussion. A. S. KOK (*Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde*, 1884, IV, 130) comments on the fact that scholars had failed to notice the use of "the so-called Shakespeare-sonnet" in Holland during the seventeenth century. Vondel himself often used this form for his sonnets, but we must not therefore assume that he knew Sh.'s own lyrics, though he was acquainted with other English models. S. J. C. B. (the same, 1894, XIII, 179-184) agrees that Vondel, who used the Shakespearean sonnet-form twenty-six times, knew English poetry but not necessarily Sh.'s lyrics. RENETTA PENNINK (*Nederland en Sh.*, 1936, pp. 15 f.) notes a number of parallels between Sh. and Vondel; but the latter's first "Shakespearean" sonnet was composed in 1628, at which time only one edition (1609) of Sh.'s sonnets had been issued. Possibly, Pennink suggests, Vondel's English teacher, THOMAS LEAMER, might have called the 1609 lyrics to his attention; but she points out the unlikelihood that Leamer, one of a circle of "theologizing" intellectuals, would have known Sh.'s sonnets—"everything is possible, but this is improbable"—and decides that Vondel took the Shakespearean sonnet-form from English writers earlier than Sh.

¹ Mention may be made of HELENE SWARTH's "Twee Sonnetten [71, 73] van Sh.," *Ons eigen Tijdschrift*, 1926, IV, 268. A reprint of Q (two hundred copies) was printed by A. A. M. STOLS at the Trajectum ad Mosam Press, Maastricht, 1923.

M. B. RUUD (*Essay toward a History of Sh. in Denmark*, 1920, pp. 41 f.) gives details about DANISH translations of 27 and 30 in 1855 and of 22, 29, 54, 71, 145 (by CASPARA PREETZMAN) in 1869. Both he and P. V. RUBOW (*Sh. paa dansk*, 1932) agree in praising the complete verse translation made by ADOLF HANSEN,¹ at Copenhagen, 1885, which L. MAGON (*Jahrbuch*, 1933, LXIX, 180) describes as a model for later translators. Rubow also gives details about four sonnets translated by VALDEMAR ØSTERBERG. RUUD (*Essay toward a History of Sh. in Norway*, 1917, pp. 17 f., 74-79) tells of "the first Norwegian translation of any part of Shakespeare," namely, "a rendering of Sonnet CXXX in popularized Eastern . . . Landsmaal" by an unknown poet in 1872, and of discussions by various critics, notably S. B. JENSEN and CHRISTEN COLLIN.² In the year after his book appeared EDVARD ALME published *Ein Flokk Sh.-Sonnettor* (Bergen, 1918), a Landsmaal version of twenty sonnets (18, 19, 27, 28, 30, 33, 49, 60, 64-66, 71, 73, 74, 76, 81, 87-90). C. R. NYBLOM's *William Sh.s Sonetter* (Upsala, 1871) and SOPHIE BONNEVIE's "Fem Sonetter [18, 65, 91, 98, 99] av. Sh." (*Samtiden*, 1916, XXVII, 279-283) may also be noticed. Nyblom inspired the adequate account of the sonnets in HENRIK SCHÜCK's *William Sh.* (Stockholm, 1883), in the course of which (pp. 179-201) several translations, as of 50 and 127, were included. AUGUST BRUNIUS (*Sh. och scenen*, 1916, pp. 43-58), too, discussed the sonnet problems at some length and gave English and Swedish texts (the latter sometimes by Nyblom) of various sonnets, including, in whole or part, 29, 50, 51, 52, 86, 94, 110. But, in general, the SCANDINAVIAN countries have shown less interest in translations than might have been expected.

In SPAIN D. MATÍAS DE VELASCO Y ROJAS, MARQUÉS DE DOS HERMANAS, called the first volume of his translation of Sh.'s works (Madrid, 1877) "Poemas y sonetos." Although it contained full versions of *Venus* and *Lucrece*, only thirty-six sonnets,³ illustrations for a "Breve estudio sobre los sonetos de Sh.," appeared in prose translations. He also included excerpts from the sonnets in his *Pensamientos, máximas, . . . de William Sh.* (Madrid, 1879, pp. 17-19). All were turned into prose by LUIS ASTRANA MARÍN (Madrid, 1929, 1933). M. MORERA Y GALICIA translated into Catalan *XXIV sonets de Sh.* (Barcelona, 1912),⁴ afterwards enlarging his work to fifty-seven sonnets, *Selecta de sonets de Sh.* (Barcelona, 1913).⁵ Versions of thirteen are printed in FERNANDO

¹ Hansen's translation of "Seks Sonetter af Sh." (25-30) was published in *Tilskueren*, 1884, I, 151-154.

² COLLIN in *Samtiden*, 1916, XXVII, 251-278, translated four sonnets completely (71, 72, 90, 116) and seven partially (29, 55, 66, 73, 110, 111, 144), while AASMUND VINJE translated one (30).

³ 1-3, 7, 19, 25, 27, 28, 43, 48, 50-56, 59, 60-66, 78, 113, 116, 123, 127, 130, 131, 137, 138, 140, 146.

⁴ 1, 8, 23, 27, 29, 30, 33, 44, 57, 66, 71, 73, 74, 91, 93-95, 116, 121, 140, 146, 147, 149, 154. Perhaps mention should be made, also, of the extremely free translations of five sonnets (29 and 116 alone are recognizable) by MIGUEL ANTONIO CARO (*La España moderna*, 1892, IV, 185 (August), 26 (December); 1893, V, 140 (January), 48 (October), 42 (November).

⁵ Adding 12, 17, 35, 50, 51, 54, 60, 61, 64, 70, 75, 87, 90, 92, 96-99, 102, 105, 106, 109, 111, 113, 119, 128, 129, 137, 138, 141, 143, 144.

MARISTANY's *Las cien mejores poesías (líricas) de la lengua inglesa* (2d ed., Barcelona, 1921)¹; and of twenty-eight, made by JOSÉ PABLO RIVAS, FERNANDO MARISTANY, CARMELA EULATE SANJURJO, and GABRIEL DE ZÉNDEGUI, in volume IV of *Las mejores poesías (líricas) de los mejores poetas* (Barcelona, 1921 [?]),² but the first complete Catalan version, *Els Sonets de Sh.* (Barcelona, 1928), was made by C. M. PUIG. Details about scattering translations of certain sonnets—as of ten (18, 25, 29, 37, 66, 71, 100, 121, 138, 153) by JOSÉ DE ARMAS Y CÁRDENAS in *Cuba contemporánea*, 1915, IX, 72–77—may be found in E. J. MARTÍNEZ, *Sh. en España*, 1918 (pp. 180–183), and in RAMÓN ESQUERRA, *Sh. a Catalunya*, 1937 (pp. 158 f., 189 f.). But one should mention here the versions of 1–26, 27–43, by MARIANO DE VEDIA Y MITRE, published in Buenos Aires in 1929 (*Verbum*)³ and 1937 (*Nosotros*, 2d series, III, 248–256).⁴

MARCU BEZA (*Sh. in Roumania*, 1931, p. 52) refers to translations of a few sonnets into ROUMANIAN, including some by HENRY MARCUS, 1923. In HUNGARY in 1845, according to YOLLAND (*Hungarian Quarterly*, 1939, V, 292), EMILIA LEMOUTON DE BOIDEFRE “undertook to translate all Shakespeare’s works,” but “luckily for Hungarian literature” she gave up the task after publishing five plays. “The great edition” (p. 295) of the Kisfaludy Society, Pest, 1864–1878, contained in its final volume (XIX) the sonnets in a translation by KÁROLY SZASZ the YOUNGER and VILMOS GYÖRY, and another edition, this time reduced to six volumes, was issued at Budapest in 1889–1892. I have been unable to see the translation of VILMOS ZOLTÁN, Budapest, 1909, listed by TANNENBAUM, 1940, no. 313. Ten of the sonnets,⁵ translated by VILMOS TOLNAI, were published in 1910 (*Magyar Sh.-Tár*, III, 114–120) and all by ZOLTÁN FERENCZI in 1916, 1918, 1919, 1922 (the same, IX, 252–261, X, 221–237, XI, 232–250, XII, 56–66) and by LÖRINC SZABÓ in 1921 (*Nagy Irók—Nagy Írások*, Budapest, volume IX; reissued as a separate volume in 1923). B. E. ALEXANDER included translations of four complete sonnets (94, 116, 121, 129) and extracts from almost forty others in his *Sh.-Breviárium*, Budapest, 1924 (pp. 234–246). Excerpts in English and Hungarian from some twenty sonnets enliven IMRE BLANÁR's *Shakespearean Quotations*, a Budapest calendar for 1928. “Undoubtedly, in the works of more than one [Hungarian] writer,” says ZOLTÁN HARASZTI (Boston Public Library, *More Books*, 1929, IV, 104), “one could point out instances of Shakespeare’s direct influence. . . . The rich, mellow lyricism of the *Sonnets*, for instance, may be felt in some of the poems of [Michael] Babits.”

To bring this story to a rapid close, mention may be made of the translations

¹ The same thirteen he translated for *Las mejores poesías*.

² 1, 2, 23, 25, 29, 72, 103, 121, 149 by Rivas (all of these plus 71, translated into Castilian, had appeared in Rivas's *Antología de poetas extranjeros antiguos y contemporáneos*, Madrid, 1920, pp. 51–56); 17, 18, 27, 30, 33, 50, 60, 66, 71, 73, 74, 106, 116 by Maristany; 32, 127, 142, 143, 152 by Sanjurjo; and 146 by de Zéndégui (see his *Sones de la lira inglesa*, 1920, p. 77).

³ 17–26 are in the August issue (No. 73, pp. 165–176) of *Verbum*. The issue (April?) containing 1–16 is not accessible to me.

⁴ In *Nosotros*, 1923, XLV, 75 f., L. M. DÍAZ has translations of 2, 62, 146.

⁵ 27, 29, 30, 32, 38, 39, 43, 46, 47, 56.

into BOHEMIAN of A. KLÁŠTERSKÝ (Prague, 1923); and into POLISH of KONSTANTY PIOTROWSKI (twenty-four sonnets, Wilno, 1850)¹; of MUS, a name identified by JOSEPHINE CALINA (*Sh. in Poland*, 1923, p. 75) as representing MARYA SULKOWSKA (1-134, 137-154, Cracow, 1913); and of JAN KASPROWICZ (Warsaw, 1922). The sonnets were at least talked about in RUSSIA by C. E. TURNER, Professor of English Literature in the Imperial Alexander Lyceum, St. Petersburg, during the middle years of the nineteenth century, but Turner's words can hardly have aroused enthusiasm among his students. For their benefit he published in 1864 a manual called *Our Great Writers*. Few critics have surpassed him in damning the sonnets (I, 155): "We can only wish with Hallam that he [Sh.] had never written them. . . . The whole series . . . reveals to us a picture of crime, weakness, and folly, which we are ill-inclined to associate with the name of Shakspeare. For a long time these sonnets were neglected and but little read; but, as if in revenge for past neglect, they are now as extravagantly admired as they were before unjustly scorned. . . . Their general construction is laboured and obscure, and they abound with conceits which are more remarkable for their quaintness than any deep reflection or philosophic truth. They . . . in general lack any great imagination. The Sonnets are the only volume of Shakspeare's works which fails to interest and delight." An occasional Russian tried to find out for himself whether Sh. was a non-dramatic poet of any merit. ERNST FRIEDRICHS, for example, discussing "Sh. in Russland" (*E. S.*, 1916, L, 126), records that in his attempt to introduce the sonnet-form into Russian poetry PUSHKIN studied Sh. as well as Petrarch and Dante. But the first translation of the sonnets was made by N. W. GERBEL in 1880 (in N. B. Gerbel's *Sh.*, III, 547-602; see *N. Sh. S. T.*, 1880-1886, p. 438, and Friedrichs, p. 130), and a second, by various authors, was included in the complete works as edited by S. A. VENGEROV and others, volume V (St. Petersburg, 1904).

In June, 1940 (truly a "period of world-wide tribulation"), MINORU TOYODA, of the Imperial University of Kyushu, published an interesting monograph on *Sh. in Japan*. Sh.'s name, he observes (pp. 4 f.), first appeared in JAPANESE in 1841 and next in 1853, the first complete translation of a play (*Julius Caesar*) was made in 1883 (p. 32), and the first translation from the non-dramatic poems, TOSON SHIMAZAKI's *Venus* (p. 60), came out in 1896. While the plays naturally overshadowed the non-dramatic verse, university courses and histories of English literature kept directing some attention to the sonnets, and in 1928 (pp. 83, 129) English texts of *Venus*, *Lucrece*, and the sonnets, with introductions and notes by YOSHISABURO OKAKURA, were included in the Kenkyūsha English Classics series. In the one complete Japanese version of Sh., that made by YUZO TSUBOUCHI (pp. 51, 124 f.) and published by the Waseda University Press, *Venus* and *Lucrece* appeared in one volume, 1927, and the sonnets in another, 1928, with revised versions of each in 1934. "Is it not in mutual understanding and spiritual brotherhood that the final hope of humanity reposes?" Toyoda asks (pp. vii f.) before acknowledging his "profound gratitude" for the "official interest" taken in his book by "the Cultural Work Bureau of our Foreign Office." He predicts (p. 118) an ultimate "appre-

¹ They are 8, 19, 22, 24, 27, 29, 30, 33, 47, 54, 65, 72, 73, 75, 77, 95, 98, 99, 102, 104, 105, 109, 116, 128.

ciation of Shakespeare by the [Japanese] people in general, to whose unsophisticated hearts he cannot but appeal, for he knows them and is their friend." Sh., like misery, acquaints a man with strange bedfellows.

A few other details deserve rapid mention. YIDDISH translations published by ABRAHAM ASEN (see also his sketch in the 1938-1939 *Who's Who in American Jewry*) from 1933 to 1939 are referred to by TANNENBAUM, 1940, no. 355. INDIA, according to R. G. SHAHANI (*Sh. through Eastern Eyes*, 1932, p. 103), has paid little attention to Sh.'s poems; "none of these, excepting the Sonnets, awakens much interest," and "as a rule, they are regarded as mere 'asides' of Shakespeare." A complete LATIN translation by A. T. BARTON (*Gulielmi Sh. carmina quae sonnets nuncupantur*) was published by John Harrower at the Riccardi Press, London, 1913.¹ In another London edition, 1923, HARROWER has an introduction in which he declares (pp. v f.) that "perhaps no more difficult task in its kind was ever attempted," and he praises Barton's "ingenuity of thought, the felicity of diction and the apparent inevitableness of the Latin counterpart, which disdained the facile and superficial equivalent, and faced with unflagging courage the hard problem of representing in melodious Latin the truth . . . of the original." DEMETRIUS CACLAMANOS (*N. & Q.*, November 26, 1938, CLXXV, 389) announced that a modern GREEK translation of twelve sonnets would appear in his forthcoming *Anthology of English Poets* (1939?).²

The vogue of the sonnets has been manifested throughout the so-called civilized world. Whether their influence has been equally widespread is a question that cannot be answered here. No informed reader of Shakespearean scholarship and criticism can possibly doubt that they have encouraged and fostered world-wide folly and what John Racster in 1598 (*William Alablaster's Seven Motives*) called "some smacking of tongues, but small taste of artes; some rubble of Philology, but few grounds of Philosophy." At many of the effects they have produced on human minds, we which now behold these present days have eyes to wonder but lack tongues to praise.

¹ For scattered Latin translations see also the introductions to 18, 54, 146, 148.

² See also the introduction to 104.

APPENDIX XIV

GENERAL CRITICISM

The following extracts, which are supplementary to Appendix XIII, contain typical pronouncements, chronologically arranged, by British, American, German, French, and Italian critics on the meter, structure, diction, imagery, and general style of the sonnets and on the latter as a whole.

GEORGE CHALMERS (*Supplemental Apology*, 1799, pp. 82 f.): Of those Amatory Verses [the sonnets], it may be truly said, that as a whole poem, which is often tied together by a very slight ligature, they have two of the worst faults, that can degrade any writing; they are obscure; and they are tedious. Spenser, who furnished the model of them, has his obscurities, and tediousness; but he has withal, more distinctness, in his topicks, and more facility, in his style: Shakspeare plainly endeavoured to go beyond the mark of his rivalry; but, in affecting the sublime, he sunk, by a natural cadence, into the unintelligible. Spenser having no rival, and only a single object, caught at such topicks of praise, as he thought would please the most, and adopted such a style, as he could most easily manage. Of such a poet, as Shakspeare, it may easily be conceived, that he has ma[n]y happy phrases, and elegant lines, though they are generally [p. 83] darkened by conceit, and marred by affectation; with as many happy phrases, and elegant lines, Spenser has fewer conceits and less affectation; having from inheritance, as fruitful a garden of images, which he watered from a deeper fountain of learning. Shakspeare, "fancy's sweetest child," shows sometimes a manifest superiority in *imagination* over Spenser, when this wonderful poet is forming the same images. By an effort of his creative powers, Shakspeare appears to have carried away the palm, in this great quality of a true poet, from his illustrious rival, even when Spenser put forth his whole strength, in cultivating the same field.

ANON. ("The Poems of Sh.," *Retrospective Review*, 1823, VII, 392 f.): The poem, called the *Sonnet*, seems to have been used, if not intended, for the developement of a single idea. It is the only poem, that we know of, in the English language, which has a defined fashion and limit; its extent being fourteen lines, neither more or less. Of these the first eight lines must have only two different terminations, and the last six lines two or three, at the option of the poet. [By way of example, Milton's sonnet "To Mr. Lawrence" is quoted in a footnote.] This, we apprehend, is the established rule. Milton has invariably observed it, and Drummond, Sidney, and Warton, we believe, with scarcely an exception. Shakespeare himself has deviated from this system: and, indeed, his poems have little claim, beyond the mere number of lines which each contains, to the title of Sonnets. The character of the Sonnet seems to approximate in a manner to the epigram. It is not a loose desultory composition of fourteen lines; but is the developement of one single idea, which is generally personal to the writer. It may consist solely of [p. 393] an elabo-

rate antithesis:—or it may be grounded on a position obvious or even common place, with a new inference deduced from it. In this case it partakes of the nature of a syllogism. In fact, it is a poem for a logician. Something must be made out in it, some feeling, or likeness, or moral. Even the compliment conveyed by it should scarcely be simple, but should be made out by comparison or deduction. In ordinary poems, the writer steepes his thoughts in the rich dews of imagination, or exalts his passion by the help of fancy, and it is all sufficient. They may be loose, wandering, unconstrained; so that they possess poetry and beauty. But a Sonnet requires more compact texture, more strength and precision; and it should have its crowning thought at the close, in the same manner as an epigram or a jest. Without this last mentioned peculiarity it may be a quatorzain, a poem, or what the reader pleases,—but it can hardly be called, in the strict sense of the term, a Sonnet.

Under this impression, we consider Shakespeare's Sonnets, *as Sonnets*, to be defective. Nevertheless they are beautiful poems, replete with airy fancy, and profound thought, and amorous desire. Or they are gentle and uncomplaining, sighing out Æolian music, or tinged with splendid colours, or dark with tears. They are, in brief, transcripts of the poet's mind, shewing it in all its changes from joy to sorrow; and never, throughout the whole range, bearing testimony of any ungenerous feeling, any base exultation, or bitter wish. There is certainly a sameness about them, from the circumstance of their being addressed principally to one person, and turning generally upon one subject. But it is not an easy thing, perhaps, to carry an ordinary reader through upwards of one hundred and fifty Sonnets, without his experiencing some little sense of weariness. Without narrative, and without event, the curiosity of the multitude is not very easily preserved.

F. G. KÜHNE (*Weibliche und männliche Charaktere*, 1838, II, 31–35): [The sonnets] supplement what, with regard to Shakespeare's mood, is not sufficiently perceptible in his plays, which were objectively constructed from within himself. They are poems to his close friend, the Earl of Southampton; they speak of the feeling of approaching age, of the consciousness of an existence that is by this time fulfilled and therefore lacks the fresh incentive of youthful aspiration, of the monotonous, forlorn quiet of his life. They no longer reveal the frivolity of a lively imagination, which [p. 32] takes the odor for the rose, but rather a musing gravity of skepticism, which searches out specific values. [He cites 27, 29, 62, 63.] But that which [p. 33] appears temperate and reconciled in the lyrical effusions because it is related to a friendly heart, presses with immense weight on the whole philosophy of life which [p. 34] is expressed in the plays of . . . [the] late period. Here, in the obscure images which show us the course of the world, we are impressed by a powerful grandeur of spirit, a logically achieved strength of mind, which makes even the greatest enormity appear true to nature, and in the midst of the overturn of all the world [p. 35] finds round about itself, only in its own firmly knit Roman strength of spirit, the assurance of an existence which cannot be shattered. Only seldom does one of his lyrical poems go far beyond the last revision of *Hamlet*; the little sonnet is a receptacle too narrow for the speculations of his profundity.

HERMANN ULRICI (*Sh.'s Dramatic Art* [1839], trans. Morrison, 1846, p. 129): [The sonnets and the lyrics in the *P. P.*] are chiefly of an epigrammatic turn,

full of verbal play and antithesis, replete with wit and acuteness, and distinguished not so much by the free, poetic flow of feeling, or by the unbroken and harmonious echo of external life in the poet's rich and exquisite sensibility—wherein, in truth, the subject-matter of lyrical poetry consists—as rather by the depth and fulness of the thoughts and reflections. They argue far too much; they are more like speeches than lyrical songs; indeed, we might justly describe them as dialogical, in so far as the reasons and objections, the principles and views, as well as the whole personal character of the persons to whom they are addressed, find distinct utterance in them.

GEORGE GILFILLAN (*Poetical Works of William Sh. and the Earl of Surrey*, 1856, pp. xxxiii f., xxxvi f.): [Sh.'s] principal faculties may be classed as universality, impersonality, imagination, wit, humour, and a knowledge of the springs of human action absolutely boundless. How are these displayed in Shakspeare's poetry? As the ocean is displayed in a little creek, and as the sun in a wave of water, they are there; but there, diminished in size and lessened in force and lustre. The "Venus and Adonis," "Lucrece," and the "Sonnets," bear a certain proportion to Shakspeare's general powers, and to his greater achievements; but not a proportion nearly so large as that between the "Comus" and "Lycidas" of Milton and his "Paradise Lost." Indeed, we fear that but for the popularity of his plays, his poetry had ere this been known [p. xxxiv] only as that of Quarles, Crashaw, and Donne is now known. For Shakspeare's peculiar gift of universality, the power of wide, total, and catholic vision, there was little scope in small love poems, although glimpses of it appear particularly in the "Sonnets." . . .

[P. xxxvi] Let . . . [readers] admire the Sonnets for the exquisite beauty of their imagery, which appears in more lavish abundance than even in his dramas—for the melody of their versification, a melody unparalleled for its compass, variety, and richness, . . . [p. xxxvii]—for the blended power and sweetness of its language, which resembles now a stream of honey, and now a strong, clear river—and for the conviction which they force upon us, that Shakspeare, with all his transcendent powers, had his weaknesses, his chagrins, his jealousies, and his melancholies as well as other men—and thus teach us the frailty of man, "the glory and the nothing of a name," and that there is something more needed for the happiness and peace of the heart than intellect or genius.

CHARLES BATHURST (*Remarks*, 1857, pp. 110 f.): The Sonnets are of immense value in enabling us, as the readers of his plays are most of them constantly desiring, to see Shakespeare as a poet, entirely distinct from what he is as a dramatic writer. Reflections, feelings, the richest expressions founded on a boundless store of images in the mind, we constantly find piercing through the business of the stage, and either diverting us from it, interesting as it usually is, or heightening and illustrating it in the characters of those who are engaged in it. Here we have it alone. Here is no stir or bustle; no events; no characters but his own; no hurry in the composition; no constraint; no comic, of course; and what is remarkable, a great similarity in the turn of thought, compared to the wonderful variety, which, in his plays, is so great that he seems

to be always beginning again, learning his [p. 111] art anew, or rather, drawing fresh from the fountain of nature, as in a constantly recurring youth; so differently from the practice of most artists of all kinds, who seem in a great degree to establish a habit, on which their succeeding productions are built. Coming from the plays, it was not wonderful that readers in general neglected the Sonnets; many of which certainly have the faults of repetition, conceits, and thin, if not trifling, matter. But others are among the very finest poems that can be produced; the very sweetest in versification, the richest in language, the deepest and most original in feeling and thought.

IGNATIUS DONNELLY (*Sonnets of Sh.*, 1859, p. 16): The mind of Shakspeare was that nature that although it had many periods when it soared but little above the ordinary range, yet when the inspiration was upon him, and he rose to his subject, the clogs fell from him, and words apt and fit came crowding thick and fast upon him. At such times he seemed to feel no limit to his powers. All things were conjoined in his mind. Fervor and passion, the high wings of imagination, unequalled command of language, great experience and observation of life, and a breadth and range of thought that have perhaps never been equalled. All his writings possess this unequal character, this depth and heighth, this coldness and heat, this tameness and startling originality. In his Sonnets we find it,—to much that is common-place and affected are joined some most beautiful lines and paragraphs, while the work itself must always stand high in the estimation of the scholar and the student of human nature, as affording light by which to read the obscure character of one of the most remarkable intelligences that has ever been given to the world.

ROBERT ZIMMERMANN (*Studien und Kritiken* [1862], 1870, II, 123 f.): Considering his profession as a dramatist—and apart from the fact that the sonnet imitating Petrarch's model was the fashionable lyric of the time—one would think that the sonnet form was created for Shakespeare's lyrical genius. Among all lyrical forms the sonnet, as the Italians constructed and the English adopted it, has the most dramatic temper. The first quatrain sets out an image, a feeling, or a thought, the second works out the contrast, the tercets resolve it. . . . In the art of pointing Shakespeare is a master. The striking effect of his sonnets depends chiefly on the conciseness and raciness which is peculiar to his final couplets.

His skill in forming antitheses, in pointing his concluding words, now and then becomes artificial, most of all in those sonnets which [p. 124] Bodenstedt, rightly as we think, classed among the earliest—the love story. In the remainder we are compelled to admire in satisfaction the development rich in thought, the clever turns of expression, and the beautiful rounding of periods amidst the highest flight of imagination. Among them there are only a few which, so far as expression and structure are concerned, do not deserve to be called little masterpieces.

H. A. TAINE (*History* [1863], trans. Van Laun, 1871, I, 302 f.): What wretchedness there is in these trifles of every-day life! How man's thoughts instinctively place by Shakspeare's side the great unhappy French poet (Molière),

also a philosopher by nature, but more of a professional laugher, a mocker of passionate old men, a bitter railer at deceived husbands, who, after having played one of his most approved comedies, said aloud to a companion, 'My dear friend, I am in despair; my wife does not love me!' Neither glory, nor work, nor invention satisfy these vehement [p. 303] souls; love alone can fill them, because, with their senses and heart, it contents also their brain; and all the powers of man, imagination like the rest, find in it their concentration and their employment. 'Love is my sin,' he said [142.1], as did Musset and Heine; and in the *Sonnets* we find traces of yet other passions, equally abandoned.

ANON. ("The Sonnet," *Quarterly*, 1873, CXXXIV, 196 f.): [Sh.'s sonnets] are characterised in construction by a certain apposition of terms and ideas, in which, by the juxtaposition of contrasts, force and colour are given to the sentiment—specially qualities belonging to all writers of prose and poetry in the age called Elizabethan. These appositions and contrasts are commonly summed up and enforced in the couplet, which frequently presents the result of them in some other light or aspect than that conveyed in the quatrains; often giving great piquancy and increased intensity to what has gone before. The value of these compositions lies rather in the sonnet form of idea [*sic*] being so strictly conceived and preserved, than in the perfection of their structural mould, which is confessedly inferior to the Italian. Why Shakespeare preferred this it is hard to say. Perhaps he may have found more freedom in the greater number of rhymes, or perhaps he may have thought it more agreeable to the spirit of the language in which he wrote. One thing, however, is very certain, that he must have been well acquainted with the Italian [p. 197] archetype.

EDWARD DOWDEN (*Shakspeare*, 1875, pp. 395–398): In the *Sonnets* we recognise three things—that Shakspeare was capable of measureless personal devotion; that he was tenderly sensitive, sensitive above all to every diminution or alteration of that love his heart so eagerly craved; and that when wronged, although he suffered anguish, he transcended his private injury, and learned to forgive. . . .

[P. 396] Assuredly the inference from Shakspeare's writings is not that he held himself with virginal strength and pride remote from the blameful pleasures of the world. What no reader will find anywhere in the plays or poems of Shakspeare is a cold-blooded, hard, or selfish line; all is warm, sensitive, vital, radiant with delight, or a-thrill with pain. And what we may dare to affirm of Shakspeare's life is that whatever its sins may have been, they were not hard, selfish, deliberate, cold-blooded sins. The errors of his heart originated in his sensitiveness, in his imagination (not at first inured to the hardness of fidelity to the fact), in his quick consciousness of existence, and in the self-abandoning devotion of his heart. . . .

[P. 397] The Shakspeare whom we discern in the *Sonnets* had certainly not attained the broad mastery of life which the Stratford bust asserts to have been Shakspeare's in his closing years. Life had been found good by him [p. 398] who owned those lips, and whose spirit declares itself in the massive

animation of the total outlook of that face. When the greater number of these Sonnets were written Shakspeare could have understood Romeo; he could have understood Hamlet; he could not have conceived Duke Prospero. Under the joyous exterior of those days lay a craving, sensitive, unsatisfied heart, which had not entire possession of itself, which could misplace its affections, and resort to all those pathetic frauds, by which misplaced affections strive to conceal an error from themselves.

HERMANN CONRAD ("Zu den Sonetten Sh.'s," *Archiv*, 1879, LXII, 28): [By reading other Elizabethan sonnets one can see how far] Shakspeare in these poems soars above his most distinguished contemporaries as a lyricist; how with sovereign power he here impresses upon the form an entirely distinct character, *his own*. In other poets the form is feeble and weak even to weariness; in him it becomes the expression of highly concentrated force. One might almost think that the powerful substance in this form must itself produce an effect of comic contrast. But, as a matter of fact, there is nothing contradictory between form and matter. Precisely here we learn that the form has greater merit than has usually been allowed it. It is peculiarly adapted to this poetic power productivity, and no other form could with equal success replace it. Filled with such weighty matter, it has in its solid structure something that defies transitoriness, something bronze. The sonnets stamp themselves in indelible lines upon the receptive mind. Once comprehended, they can no more be forgotten than can the sight of those very ancient, colossal monuments that seem to be the work of a long since vanished titanic force. But they are more than that: from the esthetic point of view they are *classic*. Without all temporal accessories, in them is revealed the ideal truth of an all-embracing genius. There was never a poet to draw more perfectly lust in all its frightful traits, never a poet to find better expression for a confirmed, healthy pessimism.

J. A. NOBLE ("The Sonnet in England," *Contemporary Review*, 1880, XXXVIII, 457 f.): Shakspeare has this and that quality which belonged to his predecessors—the insight of one, the imagination of another, the expressional felicity of a third; but he unites them all in a new synthesis, and for the product of this synthesis we are bound to make a new definition. Until Shakspeare has a compeer he is a class by himself, and as the world seems to have decided that the compeer has not yet arrived, he remains above all else Shakspearian. And in his poems, notably in these so-called sonnets, which are the richest and completest of them, this unique personal note is as clearly discernible as in the noblest of the plays, and much more discernible than in some of those earlier dramatic efforts which mark the tentative stage of his [p. 458] development. If we could imagine the existence of a person of cultivated taste who was still ignorant of the recognised place of Shakspeare in literature, he could not pass from the sonnet work of Shakspeare's contemporaries to that of the master himself without an instant sense of an enlarged outlook, of a freer, clearer air, of a more impressive spiritual presence. There is the recognition of an unmistakable amplitude of treatment, a large utterance, and ensuing upon this a feeling of fellowship with a soul wealthy enough to disdain

the smaller economies of the intellect. In these sonnets there is no sense of strain; we do not feel, as in reading Drummond, that the poet has touched his possibilities, but that even in his farthest reaches they are still long ahead of him. Even when the intellectual level attained by an author is not absolutely high, as it is here, there is always a felt charm in his work if it leave such an impression as this; a charm like that which belongs to the feats of some trained athlete who performs what seem muscular miracles with the graceful ease of effortless strength.

Coleridge has spoken of the "condensation of thought" in these sonnets, Dyce of their "profound thought," Archbishop Trench of their being "double-shotted with thought"; but, if we mistake not, the thing which gives to them their specific gravity is not what is usually understood by thought, but what may rather be described as intellectualized emotion—that is, the incarnation of pure emotion, which is itself too rare and attenuated an essence to be adequately and at the same time sustainedly expressed, in a body of symbol or situation which is supplied by the intellect. The simple pouring out of passion is apt to become tiresome to all save the lover and the beloved; but in reading Shakspeare's sonnets we are sensible of no loss of gusto; the last is as piquant as the first; and this because the mere passion, which is in itself an ordinary thing,—though the passion of a Titan must needs be Titanesque,—is supplemented by the tremendous intellectual force which lies behind and beneath it, and bears it up as the foam-bell is borne on the bosom of the great sea.

T. HALL CAINE (*Sonnets of Three Centuries*, 1882, pp. xii-xv): We require clearly to see first that the very early Italians themselves sometimes (though rarely) used the term SONNET in all its literal breadth of application, and next, that the first English writers who appropriated the name made no conscious effort of consequence to imitate the more approved archetypal pattern, before we approach the sonnets of Shakspeare in a temper that permits us to perceive wherein they constitute a native outcome of unsurpassable excellence and unimpeachable purity. A peculiar adaptability of language to vehicle is then seen to establish for the Shakspearean model the character of a perfect English sonnet. The metrical structure is plainly determined by the intellectual modelling. Let us therefore set ourselves to consider what constitutes the function the Shakspearean sonnet fulfils. The thing that first strikes us is that the thought, as a whole, is of the nature of an applied symbol. Then we see that it does not in the English, as in the Italian form, fall asunder like the acorn into unequal parts of a perfect organism, but is sustained without break until it reaches a point at which a personal appropriation needs to be made. Finally, we perceive that the ultimate application (which was also the primary purpose) [p. xiii] consolidates the thought, and gives it a separate and unified entity. We obtain a full view of this by careful analysis of any representative example [like 129]. . . .

First seizing the representative points of a noble idea, Shakspeare in this sonnet goes on from line to line begetting thought out of thought, kindling image out of image; yet the whole gravitates about a central scheme, and the meaning is all inwoven. Here there is no distinct plotting of thought, no systematic placing of proportionated ideas, no building up to definite point other than that indicated at the outset. Where, at the ninth line, the thought ap-

pears to take a fresh departure such as is nearly always observable in sonnets by Petrarch, it is [p. xiv] really doing no more than evolve a new aspect out of the old one. Clearly there is no other form of verse that could have been made to serve so well the uses herein compassed. The stanza did not exist that could have embraced the whole business of the first twelve lines. The nature of the thought and its method of development (covering the growth of the idea from prologue to epilogue) forbade attempt at rounded unity of presentment. It made demand of a measure linking passage to passage, not compelling a focused centralisation whereof the first word should foretell the last. A succession of decasyllabic couplets kneaded in Shakspeare's hands would doubtless have answered a similar end, but it is proof of the purity and perfectness of the Shakspearean sonnet that couplets could not have been employed. By their use the emphasis and rest of the close would have been sacrificed. No form, obviously, but that of three interlacing English quatrains of alternate-rhyming lines followed, after a pause, by a couplet, could have afforded an adequate realisation of the English idea embodied. So absolutely is this so of a representative sonnet, that it were hardly rash to say that the sonnet by Shakspeare does not exist in which the structure of thought would allow of Petrarchian treatment. The reason is not far to seek. The mind of the Italian poet was wont to hold itself at poise above a thought, revolving it inwardly until the primary uncertain outlines took consistent shape and craved balanced utterance. The mind of the English poet seized as they arose the thronging hints of an idea, and cast them forth one after one in the first beauty of conception, and knitted them into harmonious theme only in a final word of condensed appli- [p. xv] cation. And what is true of Petrarch is true of the bias of the whole Italian intellect; and what is true of Shakspeare is true of the bias of the whole English intellect. Hence the Shakspearean sonnet is distinctly the sonnet of the English mind and tongue, and must not be regarded as metrically an irregular outcome of the Petrarchian sonnet, to which, as we see, it bears not the remotest affinity of intellectual design. The relative excellence of the two models involves other considerations. All that is now necessary to establish is that the Shakspearean sonnet is wholly indigenous and, within itself, entirely pure.

SECCOMBE and ALLEN (*Age of Sh.*, 1903, I, 28 f.): Some of Shakspeare's sonnets are trivial literary exercises in the fashion of the day (as Nos. 153-154); most are the work of a consummate poetic artist, some may be the [p. 29] outcome of actual passionate experience (Nos. 129 or 141). Some are evidently written simply for the sake of their splendid imagery and melody. Others have the note of true personal feeling. Two poets—and only two—of the Elizabethan age produced love poetry in which the true note of absolute passion is struck—Shakspeare and Donne. But comparison of the two reveals the fact that, while Donne seems sometimes to set down his impressions hot and crude, in Shakspeare the passion is always mastered by the artist.

MORTON LUCE (*Handbook*, 1906, pp. 96 f.): As regards form, finish, and poetical merit generally, these Sonnets of Shakspeare are most unequal; in spite of the years over which they may be spread, their differences are striking enough to be phenomenal; they are more striking than in the "Venus" and

"Lucrece"; we have the very best of Shakespeare and the very worst, but rather more of the latter. The faults with which we are so familiar in the early dramas—the conceits, the quibbles, and a hundred others—are here in yet greater abundance, and they are often aggravated by rhyme. On the other hand, we have much that is excellent; still, if I said [p. 97] that we often have Shakespeare at his best in these poems; I was wrong; we must not look for his supreme efforts in rhyming verse; but even his desultory rhymes are here and there of surprising strength and beauty, and I must now commend them in some detail; for though we listen not among these sonnets for the soul-animating strains of Milton, they are fulfilled indeed with a music sweet as love and deep as death; we may find also, and that abundantly, Shakespeare's ever felicitous and pictured phrase, his splendid vision of imagery, that cunningest colour-art of language, a brother to that sister art of melody, begotten like her of inspiration and contemplation, twin-born with her to become the most divine utterance of the human soul.

GREGOR SARRAZIN (*Aus Sh.s Meisterwerkstatt*, 1906, p. 76): For the language of passion, tenderness, and gallantry this stanzaic form [i.e. the quatrains of the Shakespearean sonnet] is less suitable than that of the Italian sonnet; but it is well suited for meditation and subtle casuistry. Consequently Shakespeare's sonnets are essentially contemplative lyrics. They easily support the character of reflective, melancholy monologs, which even in Shakespeare's dramas are likewise often pointed to an epigrammatic conclusion by a couplet.

STEFAN GEORGE (*Sh. Sonnette*, 1909, p. 5): Among the reasons why Shakespeare's sonnets are still little esteemed by us, the most important, aside from the requirement of a very high understanding of verse, is an internal one: that our custom regards all poetry as entirely "romantic," but these quatorzains, though supreme poetry, are entirely "unromantic." The external [reason] concerns the subject. For a century editors and commentators fought fruitlessly: what was play and what emotion, who was the blond youth and who the black lady of the last section: they guessed, wrested, and erred, to the complete miscomprehension of spiritual tone. Not only in the procreation series (I–XVII), where indeed the spirit lies more hidden—no, throughout, the duller brains discovered stylistic exercises worked out to order; the baser [brains discovered] their own full loathsomeness: hardly one, however, understood the contents: the adoration before beauty and the glowing compulsion toward immortalization. In our day men and poets have spoken out plainly: at the center of the sonnet sequence, in every situation and degree, stands the passionate devotion of the poet to his friend. One must accept this even where one does not understand; and it is likewise foolish to cast aspersions, either with reproaches or with justifications on what one of the greatest mortals found good. Overmaterialistic and overintellectual ages especially have no right to bandy words on this point, since they cannot possibly suspect anything of the world-creating power of supersexual love.

SIR SIDNEY LEE (*Sh. and the Italian Renaissance*, 1915, pp. 25 f.): Responsive as he [Sh.] proves himself elsewhere to varied influences of the Renaissance, I believe that the *Sonnets* prove even more convincingly than any other of his writings how deeply he had drunk of the spring of Italian philosophy. All the

sonnetteers of Europe, from their father Petrarch downwards, enlisted under Plato's banner and preached the ideality of beauty, isolating it from its physical embodiment. As Platonic or Neo-Platonic study widened in Italy, much lyric poetry there and elsewhere assimilated in greater and greater degree the technicalities of Plato's or the Neo-Platonists' mystical conception. Michael Angelo, one of the noblest Italian champions of the Renaissance, wrote sonnets, in which the loveliness of earthly things is invariably held to reflect an ethereal light from heaven. Shakespeare immersed himself as a sonnetteer in even deeper metaphysical subtleties. Constantly he credits the beauty of the friend whom he celebrates with the qualities of a 'shadow'—the English rendering of the technical [p. 26] Latin word *umbra* which Giordano Bruno and other Italian Platonists applied to the mundane reflection of their idea or ideal of perfection—an idea or ideal which lay outside the material world. The beauty of Shakespeare's friend is (he tells us) a 'shadow' of the true 'substance' of perfect beauty; the substance is not visible to mortal eye, only the shadow is seen on earth. Shakespeare goes even a step further in his metaphysical theorizing in the *Sonnets*. Beauty in its unearthly perfection he identifies with truth, again an entity which is independent of matter and indeed of time. Constantly Shakespeare links truth and beauty together, as of the same ethereal significance and quality. The meaning of his phraseology is, as is common in such debate, often obscure. But there is no reason to doubt that one of the doctrines by which he stood when he penned his sonnets was an anticipation of Keats's mystical creed:

Beauty is truth, truth beauty; that is all
Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know.

It was by way of Italy that such doctrine reached Shakespeare in England.

T. W. H. CROSLAND (*English Sonnet*, 1917, pp. 104, 213 f.): No living man will ever convince us that he read through the sonnets of Shakespeare from No. 1 to No. 144 [*sic*] at a sitting and for pleasure. And we should like to wager that no man living or dead ever did it twice. This is not to decry the sonnet; but simply to say that the faculty for the sustained appreciation of beauty is limited. Practically every one of the great sonnets to be found in the sequences, whether early or modern, reads more finely and moves more powerfully out of its alleged (or real) context than in it. Five hundred people know almost off by heart half a dozen or so of Shakespeare's sonnets, for one who possesses, or ever will possess, more than a nodding acquaintance with them all. . . .

[P. 213] Of the *Sonnets* as a literature and apart from controversy as to their origin and autobiographical interest, little requires to be said. Like all other fine poetry they praise themselves. We may note, however, that both technically and in regard to content, some of them fall very far short of the amazing stan- [p. 214] dard of excellence the work as a whole sets up. . . . We shall not pretend that he [Sh.] failed of those formal and poetical lapses to which sonnetteers have been so prone from the first. Genius has been described as an infinite capacity for taking pains; but in the *Sonnets*, as elsewhere, this the master genius of all time appears to have been as contemptuous of pains as a schoolboy. Since, for very good reasons, Shakespeare is seldom set up as a

model for sonneteers, we shall refrain from instances. It is sufficient to note that after sonnet 144 there are three pieces (Nos. 145, 153, and 154) which are poor enough to have been written by a vastly inferior hand, and that "me," "thee," "be," "see," and so on are used for final couplet rhymes to no fewer than twenty-one sonnets, and sometimes to two in succession. Which means that one sonnet in about every seven is marred by a weak clinch.

J. C. SQUIRE (*Life and Letters*, 1920, pp. 171 f.): [Sh.] had written in some of these sonnets the greatest lyric verse in the world, and he knew it; verse which in its effortless fertility of image, its "inevitable" directness of phrase, its perfection of rhythm, must be the idol and the despair of every writer who reads it and sees Shakespeare doing a thousand times "on his head" what he himself would be proud to do once. There are contorted sonnets; [p. 172] there are even dull ones; but the best, and the best parts of the others surpass anything in English poetry. And they were, apparently, the by-product of a voluminous professional dramatist.

H. O. TAYLOR (*Thought and Expression*, 1920, II, 249 f.): The most transcendent and magnificent part of the revelation of William Shakespeare in the Sonnets by no means lies in their teasing indications of the writer's particular relations with another man or woman, or in their disclosure of an extraordinary attitude toward that other person; or in any such narrow torturing suggestion. No; the grand self-expression of the Sonnets rather consists in those same universal gifts through which the great playwright built out the human world which acts and speaks and thinks before us in his plays. In somewhat personally directed guise, the Sonnets exhibit the same qualities of temperament and character, and of thought and reflection, which in a somewhat different way are brought down from the empyrean, and directed to particular circumstances, by the characters of his plays. In both the plays and the sonnets, Shakespeare's thought, as a luminous rainbow, over-arches incident, passion or situation. He thinks the universal, and sets the concrete fact in its infinitude [107]:

"Not mine own fears, nor the prophetic soul
Of the wide world dreaming on things to come,
Can yet the lease of my true love control
Supposed as forfeit to a confined doom"—

The eternal heaven and the dreaming earth are wrought into the perpetuity of Shakespeare's very mortal love. As in the two sonnets [60, 65], beginning:

Like as the waves make to the pebbled shore

and

Since brass nor stone nor earth nor boundless sea,

the waste of land and ocean and of human grace and beauty are contrasted with the closing somewhat conventional assertion of the immortality conferred on one whose name the Sonnets do not disclose. The Plays will afford many instances of universal thought brought to play upon the little circumstance.

Besides the sweep of over-thought in the Sonnets, comparable only to the

sweep of over-thought throughout the Plays, the Sonnets otherwise disclose traits of Shake- [p. 250] speare's nature in accord with the dramatic revelation of the plays. What other Elizabethan sonnets express so sensitive a nature, or such tenderness [as 71-74, 89, 90, 139]? In the playwright, the sensitiveness of the sonnet writer is as an Aeolian harp, responsive to every chord in the scale of human joy and sorrow. It feels the impact of every passionate, ecstatic, or pathetic atom moving in the comic tragedy of human life. Through this playwright's sensitiveness his thought may apprehend each feature of life's panorama.

BENEDETTO CROCE (*Ariosto, Sh. and Corneille*, trans. Ainslie, 1920, pp. 192-194): The *Sonnets* are also based upon Italian models, where we find exhortations addressed to admired youth set upon a pinnacle, similar to those that passed between Venus and Adonis. The beautiful youth, posing as Adonis, and treated like him, became very common in our lyric poetry of the time of Marino, in the seventeenth century, as were also love sonnets addressed to ladies, possessing some peculiar characteristic, such as red hair or a dark complexion, or even something different or unfamiliar in their beauty, such as too lofty or too diminutive a stature.

Notwithstanding this literary tendency in his inspiration, Shakespeare does not cease to be a poet, because he is never altogether able to separate himself from himself, everywhere he infuses his own thoughts and modes of feeling, those harmonies, peculiar to himself, those movements of the soul, so delicate and so profound. This has endowed the *Sonnets* with [p. 193] the aspect of a biographical mystery, of a poem containing some hidden moral and philosophical sense. When we read verses such as . . . [54.5-12] we feel the commonplace of literature, revived with lyric emotion. Note too in the *Sonnets* their pensiveness, their exquisite moral tone, their wealth of psychological allusions, in which we often recognise the poet of the great plays. Sometimes there echoes in them that malediction of the chains of pleasure, which will afterwards become [as in 129] *Anthony* [sic] and *Cleopatra*; at others we hear Hamlet, tormented and perplexed; yet more often we catch glimpses of reality as appearance and appearance as reality, as in the *Dream* or the *Tempest*. The truth is that the soul of Shakespeare, poured into a fixed and therefore inadequate mould, [p. 194] his lyrical impulse confined to the epigrammatic, cause the poetry to flow together there, but deny to it complete expansion and unfolding.

GUSTAV LANDAUER (*Shakespeare*, 1920, II, 329 f.): [Many sonnets by Sh.'s contemporaries] are structurally perfect, but they are of very little importance, because they have seldom come out of a personality, because there was no need in them to restrain exuberance. Thus in content they are mainly allegorical, mythological, bombastic, or in some way rhetorical or artificial. In Shakespeare's most perfect sonnets, of which there are many, the diction is in direct contrast to the turgidity and the pathetically baroque extravagance in comparisons which was fashionable in his day, and which he himself understood and employed in grandiose manner even to grotesqueness in some of his plays and in the narrative-lyric poems. In the sonnets [p. 330], however, as befits

this form, we have an approximation of the language, in diction and syntax, to prose, which, through the compactness of the structure, the highly rhythmical symmetry, the parallelism of the rimes, is elevated into a poetry, in which the structure of language never becomes rhetoric or tirade but always plastic art and music. And Shakespeare, who came out of that frothy bombast, which was determined by his nature, by youthful habit, and by fashion, and in which pathos, richness of imagery, choice of rare phrases, affectation and studied mannerism, antithesis and wit, mingled oddly and seldom truly balanced one another, could want no better taskmaster than the sonnet.

J. J. CHAPMAN (*Glance Toward Sh.*, 1922, pp. 94 f., 104): There is . . . a difference between the Elizabethan sonnets and their continental forerunners which has not been sufficiently noticed by the scholars. The language of the continental sonneteers was more archaic than that of their British followers. In old Italian and old French sonnets the roses are wired upon an idiom which explains the pose and foundation of the whole art. Had Shakespeare adopted the Italian form of the sonnet, or used an archaic or mannered vehicle, as Dante does in his "Vita Nuova" or Ronsard in his Sequences, the [p. 95] difficulty of interpreting his Sonnets would vanish. We should accept them as things of exotic beauty, impersonal and symbolic, which derive their immortality from the intellect and make appeal to the intellect. But Shakespeare's Sonnets are written in the most ruddy, fluent, spontaneous, inspired vernacular that the English language can show. Their frequent anticlimaxes, their constant carelessness, their monotonies, their absurdities, are sustained and floated on a lyrical genius of the first order. There is no poetry in the world quite like them. Shakespeare thus turned the sonnet into something it had never been before; for its ideas and conceits remain absolutely impersonal and super-sensuous, while its language has become warm, rippling, and offhand. . . .

[P. 104] I will confess *en passant* that some of the Sonnets are incomprehensible, because the thought has become too attenuated—for example, Numbers 67 and 68; and that one or two of them are disgusting—for example, Number 118. But all are baubles, and this symbolic quality is the only quality they all have in common.

R. M. ALDEN (*Shakespeare*, 1922, pp. 126-128, 137 f., 144 f.): [Sh.] followed Daniel in adopting the "English" type of sonnet form, which had seemingly been invented by Surrey as a modification of the Italian type, and which most of the Elizabethans, despite Sidney's influence to the contrary, preferred. This form, consisting of three separately rimed quatrains, plus a final couplet, commonly produces a wholly different effect from that of the more intricately composed lines of the Petrarchans; it is rather more colloquial in tendency, more fluent, more suggestive of spontaneous utterance. On the other hand it rarely produces the exquisite sense of highly wrought perfection, as of an ivory carving, which the best specimens of the Italian type attain. It makes an impression of movement, of thought and feeling in evolution, as distinguished from that of thought and feeling recollected and made permanent "in tranquillity." At its best the three quatrains seem like incoming waves of imagery, each following [p. 127] upon its predecessor and rising a little higher; then there is a pause, when the couplet more quietly sums up or comments on

the meaning of the three. Of this the unsurpassed example is Shakespeare's 73rd. . . . Sometimes, again, as in the equally well beloved 29th sonnet ("When in disgrace with Fortune and men's eyes"), the poet may be thought to combine the advantages of the Italian and the English types, adding to the quatrain structure the characteristic Italian stroke of a pause and change of thought at the end of the eighth line, whereby we pass into a second scene distinct from that of the octave. And many other variants of structure will be noted by the careful reader. Perhaps the weakness of this form of sonnet lies chiefly in the possibility that the three quatrains may sufficiently carry out the poet's thought, and leave the final couplet as a mere appendix or anticlimax. This tendency Shakespeare did not wholly [p. 128] escape; even so fine a sonnet as the 116th . . . may seem to many readers to be at its best with the closing pair of lines forgotten. . . .

[P. 137] There is [in the sonnets] a conflict more important than that of Time with Beauty; it is that of Time with Love. The peril is that Time, in defeating Beauty, may defeat Love also; and poetry can do nothing to forestall this. The platonists had also their answer for this problem: it was that, though love is born of beauty, it properly tends to pass from the beauty of the outer to that of the inner world, and rises eventually to be a thing of the spirit. We have seen . . . that Spenser made much of this doctrine; in his sonnets called the Amoretti, written (as many suppose) for his bride, he set forth not only her beauty but "the fair idea" of her "celestial hue." Shakespeare was not a platonist. He seems sometimes to make allusive use of concepts or phrases which the members of that school had contributed to current poetry, but he was not interested in symbolism, nor in transcendental interpretations of common experience. Yet he could not avoid the problem [p. 138] for which no answer save that of the inner life has ever been found. The deepest of his sonnets of love or friendship, then, are those which represent it as an inner experience triumphant over circumstance. . . .

[P. 144] The sonnets take us much farther, in the growth of Shakespeare's poetic powers, than the [p. 145] narrative poems. One thing which we should naturally look for we still fail to find,—any notable development of dramatic method. This is not because the sonnet gives no place for such elements; for both Sidney and Drayton made their sonnets highly dramatic, at times, as some modern poets have done. Shakespeare clearly was not interested in the form from that point of view. But in other respects, whatever their chronology, his sonnets show abundant growth of the important poetic qualities which were only faintly noticeable in the *Venus* and the *Lucrece*. The sense of accurate values both in the images of external experience and the details of inner emotional action; the easy adaptation of phrasing and rhythmic movement to the natural human utterance which the verse is to carry; the mastery of words, wedding their intellectual and sensuous functions so that image, thought, and feeling all spring miraculously at once from what had seemed a common implement of speech;—these things, which we sought out somewhat hesitatingly in the narrative poems, we find on almost every page of the Sonnets.

W. F. SCHIRMER ("Das Sonett in der englischen Literatur," *Anglia*, 1925, XLIX, 14 f.): Shakespeare was also unable [to give the sonnet a definite

Elizabethan content]; the fervent enthusiasm and the impulse to give—what belongs to the Elizabethan style in art—a most intensive life with the strongest possible emphasis have not attained the mighty power of the drama in the lyrical attitude of the sonnet, where the poet speaks in the first person; and certainly not the sweetness of the unassuming songs interspersed through the plays. Both the songs and the plays are of their sort complete, and cannot be imagined in any other form. The sonnet is not a form of the baroque. The immeasurable progress since Surrey, whose sonnet form, *abab cdcd efef gg*, was consecrated by Shakespeare as *the* form of the English sonnet, need be no further emphasized. It is self-evident that in Shakespeare a congruence exists between word stress and rhythmical stress, and that an occasional reversal of the foot is the result of artistic purpose and not of incapacity. And it is significant that likewise the Surrey-Shakespearean epigrammatic form of the sonnet is not entirely preserved as such, for enjambement is permitted not only from “stanza” to “stanza,” but often the thought of the preceding quatrain is carried over into the final couplet by means of enjambement (71, 82, 108, 154, etc.). From an artistic point of view most remarkable are the mastery of the word, which makes what has often been said appear new, and the expression which is fully [p. 15] adequate for the thought.

JULIUS BAB (*Shakespeare*, 1925, pp. 205, 208): From a purely biographical point of view Shakespeare's sonnets are, on the whole, probably the poet's most important document. But at the same time they are the only one of his non-dramatic works which possesses a superpersonal, a timeless value that appeals to our emotions as directly as one of the great tragedies. This, to be sure, is not absolutely valid for the entire one hundred and fifty pieces in the collection. Among these poems a whole series are coolly controlled, conventional, artistic craftsmanship, variations in baroque taste on a set theme, fashionable, rhetorical, artificial pieces. The first seventeen sonnets, for example, are quite certainly of this sort: in seventeen different ways they say that the lovable young man to whom they are addressed has an obligation to marry in order that his beauty may not perish; and the last two sonnets in the collection are in general only two different attempts to translate a sonnet in the Greek Anthology. Even among the other poems, the whole progress of which delineates the story of so very personal a passion, more than one is a mere variation on themes already treated, a rhetorical experiment in the prevailing fashion. But, for all that, the bulk of them, with a very unusual strength of truth, give an account of a heart struggling in deep, erotic confusion. And out of this flood a few lyrical waves foam up, eruptions formed of human agony, which belong to the most powerful lyrics our race possesses. . . .

[P. 208] [Sonnets 40-42, 133, 134] give the central theme of the whole sequence of poems; they circle the tragic point at which the two experiences, the friend and the mistress, meet; and it was no happy thought, therefore, of the publisher to divide the poems thus related between the two groups, instead of letting them serve in undivided strength as the center of the whole. The catastrophe which is formed here with bitterest clarity consists, namely, in this, that the poet loses the friend and the mistress simultaneously, since they betray him with one another. And this probably was the frightful experience

that awakened Shakespeare out of his triumphant dreams, that shattered his proud feeling for the universe so deeply, so incurably. When at the beginning of the new century the chain of his bright comedies and his triumphant historical dramas is suddenly broken, when the merriment that is still attempted has a shrill, bitter ring and thereupon the great chain of tragedies begins to unroll on into the deepest pit of despair, when for him as for Hamlet his proud world goes so completely out of joint,—it was hardly a single cause that brought about this revolution; but underlying everything that may have combined to lead this proud man out of the light into the shadow, nothing exerted influence with greater strength than this terrible personal experience.

J. M. ROBERTSON (*Problems*, 1926, pp. 189, 281): An average Shakespeare Sonnet comes dancing in, as it were, with the effortless grace of a bird, which after a few easy runs takes to its wings for a still easier flight, then comes to ground with the concluding couplet. . . .

[P. 281] [The authentic Shakespearean sonnets, about a hundred in all] are a windfall for which the provoking Thorpe demands our thanks, over and above his grinning "immortality." To say with Hallam [see p. 359, above] that it were to be wished Shakespeare had never written them is to be, for one thing, in spirit out of touch with Shakespeare, and to blench at doing what he perhaps of all great artists did in the fullest degree, to wit, the looking all life in the face. But the more grievous error, in the case of such a verdict by a historian of literature, is that of wishing away the richest casket of Elizabethan song. For here is a string of pearls of Proserpine, great and small, perfect and imperfect, salvaged, with a handful of other and poorer things, from the realm of Dis.

HERMANN PONGS (*Das Bild in der Dichtung*, 1927, I, 189 f.): The creative, myth-making imagination of genius breaks the circle of acquired mythology. Shakespeare's personifications of the forces of nature need no names of gods. Though he frequently makes use of them, he blends heroic human traits with superhuman nature to create the beings of his own mythology. . . . [33.1-8 quoted.] [P. 190] Shakespeare's cosmos, like Michelangelo's heavens, is vivified by such figures. The phenomena of nature, day, night, storm, waves of the sea, earth, tempest, are perceived in dramatic scenes as powerfully animated creatures, far superior to classical vividness. . . . Everywhere "personification" is the creative image of a person, giving form to a soul; creativeness is amplified from the start into a transforming construction of images, as in earlier demon creations. The passionate nature gods of Shakespeare represent only an expanded stage of the mythical formation of souls; it has passed beyond personification and has raised the daemonic in nature to the divine.

FRIEDRICH GUNDOLF (*Shakespeare*, 1928, I, 450-452): In the works of Shakespeare which we are leaving [the early plays] an obfuscation of the universal image even in playfulness and jest, an eruption of grief and mockery—very different from the innocent joy in atrocities of *Titus Andronicus* or the first history plays—are declared, sometimes delicately perceptible in tone, sometimes clearly expressed through hints and precepts. But even before one discovers the definite reason for this change, one suspects the necessary fate of the

being testified to in such works: a soul of finest universal susceptibility and sensitiveness, of tenderest instinct for dignity, boldly and flexibly inserted into the activities of a pitilessly arrogant, wild, harsh, crafty, and domineering society, near enough to it to be aware of and harmed by its movements, not high enough in rank to suppress or even oppose it, and furthermore embarrassed and defiled by the stain of a profession which, to be sure, offered a sort of fool's freedom for seeing and saying, but also forbade the aristocratic freedom of acceptance or rejection. Let one consider such a being, a kingly soul, in the dress of fools and mimes, attracted to a member of the seen through, but affirmed, perhaps desired nobility—the frankest and most reserved of hearts seized by love for a definite creature in that world—a very possible destiny in the loosened intercourse of Renaissance society, which still kept the classes distinct, but dangerously and alluringly permitted its individuals changes in every direction. Then one becomes aware of an abundance of miseries, perhaps hard to understand today, but then necessary: Shakespeare's sonnets are their most gloomy witness. They revolve about the tension of heart which, devoted entirely to an earthly visible existence permeated by secret forces, without belief in a distracting life to come, without a binding faith in God, engrossed like none other by the vital present and its dangers—natural and spiritual change, mutability, corruption—plunges into a human relationship that threatens all its tender and intimate nerves, its passionate pleasure in physical things, its dignity, its humble, though proud, desire. The battle between such devotion and such self-preservation is the actual source and content of the sonnets, from the sensual wooing of the beautiful form to the tearless, disconsolate, shuddering glance at the fall of that form and its environment, from germinating love to ruinous death, inclusive of earthly goods and hurts that [p. 451] fill this abyss: lust, greed, humility, pride, shame, property, loss, and fame.

Partly through embarrassment, partly through stupidity, people who are more aware of the matter than of the content, of the object than of the hand and soul that shape it have attempted to ascribe the sonnets to the stylistic exercises of the Renaissance. They are unmoved by the glowing tension of tone and image, a tension that here for once reveals in almost dangerous nakedness the soul hidden in a world it activates. Several motives of fashionable Petrarchism have indeed been employed in the sonnets, but nothing remains as a mere discharge of bombast and bright decorations. Rather these poems are distinct from all Renaissance lyrics because of their almost spasmodic parsimony of gestures which strive rather to conceal than to announce, because of their material tightness which includes the trite, the low, and the nauseous, because of their gloomy compactness of emotion, because of their fear of a beautiful line, because of their mysterious sobriety in which no claptrap, no rhetorical learning or contemplation thrives. Shakespeare's sonnets are saturated with a hard, earthly philosophy, entirely without an "idealistic," sensitive, enthusiastic escape into a metaphysical world behind the world away from the present, no matter what its nature. Only a man to whom mortal life meant actual and unique totality, who had accepted space and time as the only conceivable vehicles for human powers, values, and talents without any question of the after-life, could write these verses, while Petrarchists and

Platonists, having or not having faith, often took their content and their matter from the sweetly melancholy afterglow of heaven or ideas.

The sonnets, joined in groups according to motive, though without continuous composition, and transmitted, most probably, in the order of their origin, are occasional poems in Goethe's sense, though more tightly knit than the creations of German *Sturm und Drang* and Romanticism. They contain observations, events, and conditions, at the base of which the immediate substance of life is visible, though they discuss it without narration and without sensibility. The fearful intensity of expression may here and there mislead the scholarly researcher into discovering a confessional realism . . . [*sic*] but the sonnets do not bring us very much closer to the events of Shakespeare's life than his plays, which reveal and hide them in the universe. True, we sometimes believe that here we can catch the poet's soul more nakedly, since it appears less material. [P. 452] Whoever is more interested in events than in realities can discover this much in the sonnets: Shakespeare loved a young aristocrat (the person is unimportant), despite the barriers of rank. He loved him to the point of self-denial, but not of delusion, and—as is to be expected in such a union—he suffered many misfortunes that arose from the differences in rank and age, in family and knowledge, and from social and personal conditions. Clear also, not in fact but in the manner of expression, are the careless humiliations in their intercourse and the deeper wounds which the unconditionally devoted heart received from the estrangement or coolness of the beautiful young patron—as in the case of the dark lady: which received immortality in its own sequence of sonnets. These highly personal pains, commonplace as occurrences, but shocking as experiences and confessions of Shakespeare, are elevated, obscured, or illuminated by his enduring knowledge of the course of the world and his metaphysical dread of mutability.

The poet's sorrows and desires are revealed less in the sequential order of the sonnets, which is interrupted or confused by a number of coincidences of mood (for example, sonnet 42 already anticipates a motive out of the dark lady group, though with different tone and aim), than in the classification of their content. In all the human and unique adventures of his love, drawn from time, space, and custom, he seeks to protect it, by means of instinctive wisdom or mere innate common sense, by means of prophetic profundity, or by means of judicial clearness, against three destinies, inescapable but—as the torture and courage of love must realize again and again—betrayable, conquerable: the passage of time, be it fall or decay . . . [*sic*] the enmity of the world, lies or shame . . . [*sic*] the instability of the loved heart itself.

G. F. BRADBY (*Short Studies*, 1929, pp. 6, 9 f., 25): The Petrarchan sonnet, the model most in favour with our great poets, is divided into two sections, an octet which states and develops the subject, followed by a sextet which winds up to a climax. Shakespeare, however, for his own purposes adopted another form, made popular in England by Surrey and Wyatt. It consists of three quatrains which are clinched by a final rhyming couplet. At first sight this form seems to offer a greater freedom of movement than is allowed to the more orthodox and severer type. But there are many hidden traps in it. For one thing, the climax has to be effected in two lines, often a very hampering re-

striction, and one which in a sonnet-sequence is apt to become monotonous. For another, there is a temptation to repeat the theme three times in three successive quatrains, and the thought does not always bear the strain. . . .

[P. 9] *Ars est celare artem*; but there is no attempt here [in 67] to conceal the art, nor in any other of the *Sonnets*. All the tricks of the trade, known to the Elizabethans [p. 10] and admired by them, are there in rich profusion—antithesis, laboured alliteration, “conceits,” repetitions, word-play, and mere puns. And Shakespeare takes an obvious pleasure in proving his skill at the game. . . .

[P. 25] Taken as a whole, the *Sonnets* suffer inevitably from their theme, the glorification of a type of friendship which makes no particular appeal to us. Often we feel inclined to echo Queen Gertrude and say, the poet “doth protest too much methinks,” or to cry with her, “More matter with less art.” In fact, there are moments when the *Sonnets* become a little tedious. In many of them the thought is involved and obscure; we cannot follow it without effort and a close attention to the punctuation. Many of them are merely exercises in intellectual subtlety; many are experiments in word-embroidery; many only repeat things which have been said already and which we are not eager to hear again; and all, or nearly all, bear the stamp of conscious art.

JOHN BAILEY (*Shakespeare*, 1929, pp. 62–65): It is one of the inexplicables of literary history that such poetry should have been so long neglected. Of some of Shakespeare’s greatest gifts, his humour, his miraculously varied knowledge of men and manners, his instinct for a great dramatic situation, they can, of course, exhibit nothing. Nor did they provide opportunity for the Herculean energies of his mature style. But in sheer loveliness of diction he never exceeded the finest of them; and some of them are, except one or two songs, the greatest lyrical poems which even he ever [p. 63] wrote. Every one who cares for poetry has been irresistibly driven to get some of them by heart. . . .

[P. 64] These Sonnets of Shakespeare, lovely as they are, are very far from being all loveliness. They are among the greatest of all meditations on the mystery of human nature, which is the mystery of a mortality which can never be content that the love and beauty it has known should be less than eternal. That is the greatest and most continuous of all their subjects. But they have also in them all sorts of other things. We find in them that wonderful England of Elizabeth’s days, full of love and joy and beauty and of that consciousness of a new birth and of the opening of a new era which gives all such times so peculiar a fascination. And there are all the eternal sights and sounds of earth of which poets are for ever making for us new experiences: the dawn and the sunset; day and night; winter and summer; autumn and spring; the “rough winds” that “shake the darling buds of May”; the roses of whose “sweet deaths are sweetest odours made”; the lark with which the poet identifies himself, which “at break of day arising From sullen earth, sings hymns at Heaven’s gate”; the night- [p. 65] ingale whose “mournful hymn did hush the night,” but only for a while, till the coming of summer, when “wild music burthens every bough”; these, and a hundred such details, both of nature and of life, in themselves commonplace enough till the poet touched them, make the Sonnets a picture of that same world which has wakened young

poets to their first verses in all ages and countries. There are things less universal, too; things belonging to the contemporary England, but not to that heroic and poetic England which the word Elizabethan chiefly calls up to us; rather to the new business and prosperity which came of Tudor rule and Tudor peace; the "unperfect actor on the stage" of the new theatres which meant so much to Shakespeare; the even more important lawyer with his charters and bonds, his misprisions and his patents, too often present in all Shakespeare's verse; the traveller in a wet climate with a weary horse; the "pebbled shores" of England, then beginning to send their ships across all the oceans, shores which, perhaps, Shakespeare never saw, though his exactly truthful words come to our minds before the waves on every beach; the misgoverned world of ambition and intrigue in court and city, of which, though he saw so much less than Spenser and Sidney and Raleigh, he yet saw enough to cry almost as loudly as they did for any escape from it, even the escape of "restful death." It is all these things, universal and particular, contemporary and eternal, love and death and life, spring and summer, Stratford and England, which the wisest reader looks for in the Sonnets.

CLEMENT WOOD (*Craft of Poetry*, 1929, pp. 73-75): Shakespeare's sonnets . . . are assumed to be in the conservative tendency. The scansion scheme appears from the first line of the first sonnet:

From fair- | est crea- | tures we | desire | increase. |

Take now the sixth line of the same sonnet:

Feed'st thy | light's flame | with self- | substan- | tial fuel. |

Here we have (instead of five iambs), a trochee, a spondee, two iambs, and a concluding amphibrach (that is, an iamb with an extra unaccented syllable at the end). A trochee may be inserted at any place. It is true that the pedants say [p. 74] that a sonnet should not open on a trochee, since the first few feet, they say, should indicate beyond peradventure of a doubt the pattern to be followed. But Shakespeare's third sonnet opens,

Look in | thy glass, | and tell | the face | thou viewest |

Where Shakespeare erred, in this instance at least, it is safe to follow. The seventh, eighth, thirteenth, fourteenth, and many more of the sonnets open with a trochaic foot. Variation is more than the spice of poetry; it is the life of poetry.

Or take a line like:

And stretch- | ed me- | tre of | an an- | tique song,

from the seventeenth. We have marked the third foot as if it were an iamb; but it is really a pyrrhic (∪∪); and, since the best understanding of English versification discards this, the proper scansion would be:

And stretch- | ed metre of | an an- | tique song, |

or some other division that gives only four feet to the line. Take the last line of the thirty-third:

Suns of | the world | may stáin | when héav- | éns' sun stáineth.

Here the last foot is an anapest with an extra unaccented syllable; or else the fourth is an amphibrach, and the fifth an amphibrach or an iamb with an extra syllable. A grace note, an added unaccented syllable, appears after the accented syllable of the fourth note. This is a variation which [p. 75] may appear anywhere in the line. Take a line from the sonnet before the last numbered:

Thése póor | rúde línes | of thy deceased lover.

This clearly opens with two spondees; for the opening *these* is entitled to an accent. Take the line:

Bare ru- | ined choirs, | where láte | the swéet | bírds sang, |

with an opening and a closing spondee. A line in the eighty-first sonnet proceeds:

Where bréath | most bréathes | éven ín | the móuths | of mén, |

again evidencing the use of a grace-note, perhaps accented, this time in the third foot. The hundred and seventh has as its second line:

Of the wíde wórld | dréaming | on thínks | to cóme.

This is a baffler. Two short syllables are followed by two accented ones; then a trochee, and then two iambs. Regard the first four syllables as you please: it is a definite variation, substituting for two iambic feet a sequence of unaccented, unaccented, accented, accented.

And all this in Shakespeare's sonnets!

J. W. MACKAIL (*Approach to Sh.*, 1930, pp. 118 f.): Few, if any, single lines in the Sonnets wholly outrange the finest single lines in the early poems; but it is to their larger quality that we must have regard: the quality which is akin to the rich, fully-charged, pregnant manner of Shakespeare's dramatic maturity. The searching power, the mastery which penetrates to the core of life as well as illuminating its surface, are those of the Shakespeare of the great tragedies. Study of the Sonnets is of high value not for their own sake only, but towards a larger and finer appreciation of Shakespeare's art in its development and culmination.

But the Sonnets should, first and also last, be read and studied as poetry and for their own sake. This hardly needs urging; for as to their poetical quality extremists meet, and all sane critical opinion is at one. There are other English sonnet-writers who from time to time reach heights as great. For clarity, for weight of import, for august severity, the best of Wordsworth's—and these are not a few—are unrivalled. They are not comparable in any way with Shakespeare's. The hundred sonnets of Rossetti's *House of Life*, and others of his outside of that collection, offer some parallel, though on a

different range, in their figurings upon a single group of motives, in their intensity of imaginative emotion, in their richness of ornament, and it may be added, in their conceits and mannerisms. With both poets we have to take into account sonnets outside of the two large collections, as fine as the finest within them; in the [p. 119] Shakespeare appendix, 129 'The expense of spirit in a waste of shame,' 133 'Beshrew that heart that makes my heart to groan,' 140 'Be wise as thou art cruel,' 146 'Poor soul, the centre of my sinful earth,' may be specially instanced.

But just as Shakespeare's dramatic work eclipses that of all his contemporaries—'when the moon shone we did not see the candle'—so beside Shakespeare's Sonnets the whole mass of other Elizabethan sonnet-literature pales and thins. If I may offer advice to students and to readers, it would be to know the Sonnets by heart, to allow them to sink in and germinate, to become saturated with them and to let them gradually, line by line, phrase by phrase, passage by passage, disengage their condensed sweetness and expand their concentrated power. That indeed may be said of all Shakespeare's best work. It may be said of all really great poetry; as of all those achievements of supreme genius, in any form of art, to which we find ourselves always returning, and which we always find, on returning to them, even greater than we knew.

ENID HAMER (*Metres of English Poetry*, 1930, pp. 196–198): The form of Shakespeare's sonnets is invariable [except for 145 and 126]. Being Shakespeare he dared to tempt monotony, and moreover used the simplest form of all. His is the longest of all the great sonnet-sequences, and the simplicity of his form is partly responsible for the subdued and controlled effect, the detachment with which tremendous passion is presented, as the unvarying repetition of one metrical unit contributes to the overwhelming cumulative power of the whole series.

The general impression of Shakespeare's sonnets is too well known to need illustration, and too rich to be fairly illustrated by a single quotation, but it may not be unprofitable to enumerate some of the more noticeable of his technical characteristics. He emphasises the simplicity of his technique by keeping the lines endstopped in a pro- [p. 197] portion quite unknown in his blank verse. The greater number of the sonnets are endstopped in every line, and many more have no greater variation than a single phrase covering two lines:

Fvll many a glorious morning have I seene
Flatter the mountaine tops with soueraine eie [33.1 f.].

But my fue wits, nor my fue sences can
Diswade one foolish heart from serving thee [141.9 f.].

The utmost freedom which he allows himself is that of 'Let me not to the marriage of true mindes' [116], which settles down to endstopping after the first three lines, or of 'Th' expence of Spirit in a waste of shame' [129], which has all its lines endstopped, although much broken by pauses between the feet, and especially within the feet. The proportion of lines made up entirely, or all but entirely, of monosyllables is astonishing, especially in closing lines and couplets:

All this the world well knowes yet none knowes well,
To shun the heaven that leads men to this hell [129.13 f.].

A single dis[syllable in the closing couplet is quite the most usual phenomenon:

In things right true my heart and eyes have erred
And to this false plague are they now transferred [137.13 f.].

Such lines incline, as will be seen, to be very slow of movement, and weighted with spondees, or groups of consonants, or retarded with pauses:

When yellow leaues, || or none, || or few || doe hange [73.2],

and an impression of great solemnity and deliberation, or of spiritual oppression, thus obtained, is the characteristic mood of Shakespeare's sonnets.

But in the sonnet line, as in his blank verse, Shakespeare shows a marvellous skill with a device foreshadowed in [p. 198] blank verse by Marlowe, and used in the sonnet by Drayton, the moulding of a line of monosyllables round one long sonorous and impressive word, generally, of course, a Latin derivative:

With insufficiency my heart to sway [150.2]

Who for thy selfe art so unprovident [10.2].

The admission of such words brings in an almost inevitable pyrrhic, and lightens the line, or concentrates its weight on the stressed syllable of the long word. The same kind of concentration takes place where Shakespeare introduces one of his favourite compound adjectives:

The sad account of fore-bemomed mone [30.11]

And his loue-kindling fire did quickly steepe
In a could vallie-fountaine of that ground [153.3 f.].

and it is by the varied position of such rhythmic 'crests' in the line that Shakespeare obtains the most subtle music and movement from the commonest of foot-modulations, pyrrhic, spondee, and initial trochee.

Many of the sonnets are composed of a single sentence whose divisions correspond with the quatrains and the couplet. The most marked pause is generally at the end of the third quatrain, and quite often the long sentence ends there, and the couplet contains a bitter summary or comment. In a few of the finest, 'When to the Sessions of sweet silent thought' [30], and 'Not mine owne feares, nor the prophetick soule' [107], there is a definite pause at the end of each quatrain, but there is hardly ever a more marked break after the second quatrain than at some other place, or any separation of ideas, or renewal of poetic force at the ninth line, which would suggest the division into octave and sestet.

LOUIS GILLET (*Shakespeare*, 1931, pp. 142-144): The pathos of the sonnets is the poet's clairvoyance and the sharpness of analysis that never leaves him. He knows his evil and describes it with precision and incomparable splendor of imagery. Some of the most beautiful lines ever written are in this jewel box of woes. I do not believe that for a single moment he, like Baudelaire and

Verlaine, experiences the sensation of repentance. The idea of sin, like that of law, is absent. For Shakespeare no reproach lies in following nature; pleasure is never criminal, can never cause shame. He hardly even recognizes his offenses against public opinion. But one cannot defy decorum with impunity. Never to say "no" to life, to accept all the risks, all the invitations of happiness, to venture all experiences is a temerity that costs dear. One cannot brave the storms without danger. The poet proved it, and left us in his *Sonnets* the log-book of his shipwreck.

Worse is his sense of humiliation, of his frightful dependence, of his dignity abdicated for a being who does not deserve it, who is only an illusion of youth and of life, a deceitful apparition that nature has clothed the better to torment us: ah! that refrain of slavery, that groan of servitude, rend the heart. . . .

[P. 143] This was an illness, a fever of three years, a crisis in which the poet touched the depth of human misery. He made this formidable voyage, this descent to the Styx. Up to the present he had seen only the surface of life—what one can learn in history and in books, what one imagines in dreams. Now he knew of what existence is made. [66.1-3 quoted.] . . . This already sounds like certain bits of *Hamlet*. [He then quotes "the furious sonnet 129."]

Such is the balance-sheet of this *De Profundis*. Was this the recovery? How did the experience end? We do not know. The poet gave us only the secret of his miseries. Perhaps it would have been better for his glory for them to have passed into silence, and for the memory of this cruel occurrence [p. 144] to have been buried in his tomb. Perhaps he would have gained as a man, but his confession disarms us. In an imperishable sonnet [142] the poet has said: "Love is my sin." And again in this "Gide-like" cry, the most beautiful that I know, "I am what [*sic*] I am." No one has the right to absolve or condemn him.

JOACHIM MÜLLER ("Das Zyklische Prinzip in der Lyrik," *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, 1932, XX, 3-6): Out of the tension between renunciation and desire arises this wish: Preserve thy beauty as thou begettest a son. This motive, thus made concrete in the third sonnet, is passed on and balanced, as it were, between the two poles, transitory beauty and victory over mutability through procreation of beauty. Yet in Shakespeare there is no progressive deepening of the motive from sonnet to sonnet, but the expression tautens and again relaxes in the next poems. There is an intensification which draws the general relationship of life and death into the tension (VI); the [p. 4] personal offense is impressively symbolized in powerful comparisons (VII, XII, for example); the person addressed is reminded of his responsibility to universal law. But again and again we discover an ebbing in the flood of language and imagery, a breaking off of the language gesture, which none the less does not let these poems escape the motivating association. Now in sonnet XVI there occurs what I call *cyclic variation*: the motive hitherto employed is enlarged by the insertion of a new thought: let thy continued existence in a descendant bear witness to the truth of my song. This variation again produces another: may my love be as faithful as my song (XXI); but this urges the expression of this love into greater proximity than before (XXII). Here again there is a tension in which this variation in motive oscillates between

them to have passed into silence, and that the memory of this cruel occurrence [p. 144] had been buried in his tomb. Perhaps he would have gained as a realization and despair, grateful homage and painful complaint. Here too it happens that a new turn in the thought seizes upon a language image which illumines the poetic attitude even to its ultimate depth, so that a motivated nuance compresses and points the language gesture without thereby definitively exhausting the basic motive. The new motivating insertions (the hint in XLI that the friend addressed has stolen the poet's mistress, or the dialectic of love in XLIII and XLIV, which becomes a mythology of love (XLV and XLVI), the reintroduction of the absence motive (XLIX)) lead ever and more strongly to the lyrical rounding out of the experience. Now the cyclic stream flows along so uncontrollably that it can absorb all isolated gestures even though they become more numerous; it is no longer only borne and fed by larger motive-bearing tributary streams. Now the old motives themselves once again emerge from the flood; they have been transformed in the course of lyrical expression, and for a moment become language reality, then vanish again. So fares it with beauty, with patient devotion, with sorrowful renunciation. Out of this change and combination of motive a frightful intensity sometimes develops: transitoriness and decay [p. 5] plainly become menaces to life and world-weariness (LXIV-LXVI). But these sonnets show particularly that they never escape the center of gravity of the experience, but in the end always reach back into the motive center which is called "love." [65.9 f., 13 f., and 66.1, 13 f. quoted.] . . .

(The form of the sonnet, moreover, which tolerates no transition, of its very nature makes it necessary once more to join the pole of experience and thus close the circle of tension.) Here we recognize something very fundamental: only the reentry into the center of the experience here prevents the smashing of the cycle. Here there must be a principle, which, in a significant way, helps constitute a cycle. I call it *reference to the center of gravity or central point of the motive*, which is present in all poems of a genuine cycle. All the poems, of course, stand at different distances from the center, they allow it to be more or less plainly perceived, but they are never free of its influence, which shows itself particularly when the individual movement of a single poem is so strong that it threatens to break off from this center. (And when this actually happens, the cycle is destroyed.) From this one likewise perceives that the genuine cycle is really a "ring" of poems, not a mere "series."

Let us examine the Shakespeare sonnets still further. The motive that love is expressed only in the verse of the poet, is taken up and carried on in new directions: the lover alone gives the poet the power to sing. Through his song the beloved is immortal (LXXXI). Again one may find a tension in this motive of eulogy: the poet compares his plain verse to that of other, more ornate poets. This tension is interwoven with the old, again emerging motive of suffering, which here rises into bitterness and hatred. The gesture once again becomes pregnant with destiny while it shows how love endangers existence ("And life no longer than thy love will stay") (XC and XCII). The reemployment of older motives ebbs away in a melancholy line, until a new statement (CI) again brings rapture and motion: pain has been overcome; kindness once more imparted drives to a new announcement of love (CIII). Deepest profundity is revealed. The poet grasps his attitude in a pregnant

gesture. He attempts a final formula for the center of the experience that supports the ring of poems:

"This [*sic*] kind and true is all my argument" (CV).

[P. 6] Love becomes eternal love, devotion a religion of love:

"For nothing this wide universe I call,
Save thou, my rose; in it thou art my all (CIX).

You are my all the world . . .
You are so strongly in my purpose bred
That all the world besides me thinks are dead" (CXII).

Love has become everything, everything love. Pain, absence, time's mutation are repelled by the unconditioned character of love. *In the last sonnets of the cycle the center of the experience is itself elevated into the actuality of the verses.* At the same time the personal element has become embedded in the general movement of life. Therewith the song has become authentic. *The lyrical gesture has fulfilled the basic motive, carrying it on from sonnet to sonnet, in all its poetic possibilities.*

ERNST VOEGE (*Mittelbarkeit und Unmittelbarkeit in der Lyrik*, 1932, p. 115): In Shakespeare the first twelve lines are divided into 3 quatrains, each of which rhymes differently in crosswise order. The last two lines rhyme with each other, and form a real unit. But the assumption that the lack of relationship of the first three stanzas to one another—in other words, their actual independence—must result in a richer structure is fallacious. This very independence is the cause of the structural weakness of the individual stanzas, and it bears the blame, inasmuch as these stanzas, opposed to the final couplet, fuse into a single, rather jointless unity. . . . [Q itself supports these notions, for] the three quatrains are placed one under another without intermediate spaces, and only the last two lines are indented. And so here we still have four members but only two binding relationships, the first of which proves the unity of the three cross-rimed stanzas, and the second establishes the unity of the complete form by combining this compounded unity of the quatrains with the jointless unity of the final couplet.

L. C. KNIGHTS ("Sh.'s Sonnets," *Scrutiny*, 1934, III, 148-150, 152 f.): The vivid and surprising 'Lillies that fester' [94.14] has been commented upon as typically Shakespearean, and indeed the image (whether borrowed or not) is typical of the way in which contrasted sets of associations are fused in the verse of the later plays. But it is hardly representative of the imagery of the sonnets. In the later plays a wide range of relevant associations, both of thought and feeling ('relevant' is clearly a matter for concrete illustration), are compressed into the single image ('The bank and shoal of time'). Images of sight, touch, muscular adjustment and so on follow in rapid succession (No catalogue of 'visual,' 'tactile,' etc., is sufficient to cover the variety), and different modes may be combined in our response at any one point. And there are those unexpected and startling juxtapositions of contrasted images:

The *crown* o' the earth doth *melt*.

This sensible warm *motion* to become
A kneaded *clod*.

Now in the sonnets not all of these characteristic uses of imagery are developed: it is largely this which justifies us in assigning them a date earlier than *Troilus and Cressida* or *Measure for Measure*. With the exception of the striking line [110.10 f.], 'Mine appetite I never more will grind On newer proof,' we can find no parallels to 'Lillies that fester.' Such lines as [110.3]

Gor'd mine own thoughts . . .

and [118.6]

To bitter sawces did I frame my feeding

[p. 149] indicate an important line of development, but there is little of the intensely physical impact that we find in *Macbeth* ('The blanket of the dark' 'We'd jump the life to come'). Most of the images—even when finely effective—arouse only one set of vibrations in the mind:

Full many a glorious morning have I seene,
Flatter the mountaine tops with souveraine eie [33.1 f.]

My nature is subdu'd
To what it workes in, like the Dyers hand [111.6 f.].

If we place 'the dust and injury of age' (108) and '... whose million'd accidents Creep in 'twixt vows . . .' (115) beside *Macbeth's*

Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow,
Creeps in this petty pace from day to day . . .
And all our yesterdays have lighted fools
The way to dusty death

and ask ourselves exactly why 'creep' and 'dust' are used in each instance, we shall have a fair measure of the later development.

But even when we have made these qualifications the stress remains on the positive achievement; there is a clear advance on the early plays. In the sonnets no image is *merely* decorative. . . . There is indeed a constant succession of varied images, which, because they are concrete and because they are drawn from the world of familiar experience, give precise expression to emotion:

Beated and chopt with tand antiquitie [62.10].
Incertenties now crowne them-selves assur'de [107.7].
But makes antiquitie for aye his page [108.12].
And captive-good attending Captaine ill [66.12].

What it comes to is this: in the sonnets, as in the later plays, the imagery gives

immediacy and precision, and it demands and fosters an alert attention. But the range of emotions liberated by any [p. 150] one image is narrower, though not always less intense. . . .

[P. 152] I do not think 'The Sonnets' in any sense an ordered collection; they vary from the most trivial of occasional verses to poems in which a whole range of important emotions is involved, and in the latter we find in embryo many of the themes of the later plays; there is variety enough to make discussion difficult. But it seems to me that two interests predominate, making themselves felt, often, beneath the ostensible subject: they cannot be altogether disentangled from each other or from other interests, and they are not quite the same in kind; but the artificial grouping seems unavoidable. One is the exploration, discrimination and judgment of modes of being— [p. 153] attention consciously directed towards the kind of integration of personality that is implied by the development of technique. The second is an overwhelming concern with Time.

T. M. PARROTT (*William Sh.*, 1934, pp. 193 f.): The English form [of the sonnet] may lack the unity of the Italian with its interwoven rhymes and the harmonious correspondence of the sestet to the octave that precedes it. Indeed from the time of Milton English poets for the most part have preferred the Italian form. Yet in the hands of such a poet as Shakespeare the English form reveals undreamed of qualities of beauty, grace, and dignity.

[P. 194] This is not to say that all the sonnets are of great and equal value; on the contrary, many of them are slight things, occasional verses, too often marred by the Elizabethan fondness for strained conceits. But when the poet is strongly moved he rises to very lofty heights of thought and to such perfection of expression as is matched, if matched at all, only in his own plays. What moves him most and stirs him to such expression is the Renaissance theme of Beauty, beauty revealed in the person of his friend, beauty that irresistibly evokes love, beauty warred upon by Time, love triumphing over the wreckage of Time, and conferring immortality on the beautiful beloved in enduring verse. [116.9-14 quoted.] . . .

It would be well for the young student to avoid a consecutive reading of the sonnets, especially if undertaken in the vain hope of puzzling out the story. It would be more profitable by far to select a few written in what Tennyson called the deeper vein, read and re-read them, get them by heart, and learn the truth of Shakespeare's words when he spoke [106.3] of

Beauty making beautiful old rhyme.

In the great sonnets, as nowhere else in his works, we may hear the voice of the supreme master of English poetry opening his heart, revealing his profoundest thoughts and most poignant emotions in accents surer of immortality than the eternity promised to the beloved friend.

GEORGE RYLANDS ("Sh. the Poet," in Granville-Barker and Harrison, *Companion to Sh. Studies*, 1934, pp. 109 f.): The *Sonnets* have this in common with the *Venus and Adonis*, that artificial and natural imagery are felicitously combined, but actual imagery predominates and is more diverse than in the poem.

It is drawn from husbandry, medicine, navigation; from the court, from music and painting, from usury and law; from the stage, military life, astronomy and alchemy. Analogies from the seasons are very frequent and these are more realistically expressed than in the poetry of Spenser and his school. Euphuism also is becoming naturalised. The diversity of imagery is only to be paralleled in Donne, and Dr Johnson's objection to the use of technical words in poetry, which is disproved by most Elizabethan poets, is completely exploded by such a sonnet as Shakespeare's fourth. It is of Donne that we think when we seek for Shakespeare's peer as a love-poet. These two poets before all others have expressed the many different shades of feeling, the varied and complex experiences and attitudes of the lover; the idealism and realism, the *Odi et Amo*, the constancy and jealousy, the daydreams and disillusion, the selfless dedication and the torments of lust. In the *Sonnets* there are direct statements, 'moral ideas,' in Arnold's words, such as

Love is not love
Which alters when it alteration finds [116.2 f.],

or

They that have power to hurt, and will do none,
They [*sic*] do not do the thing they most do show [94.1 f.],

or

till action, lust
Is perjur'd, murd'rous, bloody, full of blame [129.2 f.].

In the plays general truths abound. In the *Sonnets* the truths are more frequently particular and extremely personal in expression, the fruit of individual experience. But, as Gibbon remarked, a love-tale is much the same in Babylon and Putney, and Shakespeare's experiences and intense feelings find an echo in the heart. We read them with all the pleasure of recognition. Our whole being is reorganised. What was faint, confused and half- [p. 110] realised becomes precise, acute, ordered, permanent. Our five senses, and our five wits, our own actions and sufferings approve the evidence, and in the *Sonnets* a personality is revealed as real and as admirable as in the *Letters* of Keats. For the style also they can be read innumerable times and never without fresh shocks of surprise. The imagery is as rich as in the narrative poems and richer; but style and content are no longer separable. The metaphors are no longer decorative; like the conceits of Donne, they are the poem. Only in *A Lover's Complaint* is there something of the same maturity and intelligence. And besides a use of metaphor now concentrated, now extended, which is so happy that we seem to see the English tongue as we know it forming and evolving itself before our eyes, there is a *curiosa felicitas* in single words and short phrases; as, for example, 'Siren tears,' 'adder's sense,' 'ambush of young days,' 'tender inward of the hand,' 'Nature beggar'd of blood,' 'affable familiar ghost,' 'sin lace itself with his society,' 'what freezings have I felt,' 'chopp'd with tann'd antiquity,' 'I have frequent been with unknown minds.'

FRIEDRICH DANNENBERG ("Sh.s Sonette," *Jahrbuch*, 1934, LXX, 38 f.): [In the Shakespearean sonnet] the last two lines, which had already occupied a special place in the [French] sonnet because they were coupled by independent

rime, now stand entirely by themselves, so that they can never again out-balance the ascendancy of the first twelve lines.

These changes in the law, the result of which is the Elizabethan [or Shakespearean] sonnet in its own independent generic form, are carried into effect [p. 39] so rapidly, that, indeed, we cannot uncover the internal processes of development, though we are able to point out the beginning and the end of the proceedings. As we see, the two pairs of rimes in the first quatrain have become foreign to those in the second. The relationship in which the second stanza earlier stands to the third now determines the attitude of the first and second stanzas to each other. The three quatrains have lost every characteristic of the sonnet form: they have become nothing but stanzas. The final couplet is separated from them by a deep gulf; their breadth of thought is abruptly compressed to a narrow, ribbon-like ledge. The sonnet no longer, as in the French and Italian forms, glides to its end unconsciously and smoothly, but grows to an apex, which lacks any external bridge to the concluding couplet, set on a much lower level. Its profile resembles indeed the cross-section of a ridge of a hill with a precipitous slope to the plain below. For this reason a structural or intellectual connection is denied the Elizabethan sonnet in its transition from the twelfth to the thirteenth lines. A discursive style can never be used here, though it may distinctly characterize all the other lines. The final couplet no longer signifies a dying away or an ebbing away, but a most rigid concentration of thought, or even deduction and conclusive proof. How often the twelfth line stands in a causative relation to the thirteenth may be illustrated by the fact that, on an average, Shakespeare puts a colon between these lines in every third one of his sonnets. The comma, the mark for the shortest pause in a sentence or in a thought, is, on the contrary, found in him only four times in this place; and two of these, it is true, are in the last two sonnets, which hardly belong to the collection from the point of view of content. The Petrarchan modulation of their matter probably brought about this outward reversion to the measure of the tercet.

LUDWIG KAHN (*Sh.'s Sonette in Deutschland*, 1935, pp. 67, 83): One may see in Shakespeare's sonnet art rather a kinship with the spirit and style of the Renaissance, or one may actually detect in it the deep impress of a courtly baroque culture. In either case the aristocratic-courtly or highly civilized form of his art is far removed from everything "bourgeois." Shakespeare writes for a public of quite definite social division and artistic culture; his sonnets are directed—like all sonnets of that time—to those who knew how to appreciate them. . . .

[P. 83] In Shakespeare simile, clever comparison, epigrammatic point belong to the nature of the sonnet; they are the sonnet, they make up the sonnet, they are identical with the sonnet, for their sake the sonnet was written.

TUCKER BROOKE (ed. 1936, pp. 3 f.): This effect [of euphony and grace], in so far as it is not due to the unaccountable witchery of Shakespeare's language, arises from the apparent ease with which nearly every sonnet adjusts itself to the simple formula of three quatrains and a couplet. A strong pause in sense and rhythm at the close of each quatrain is for Shakespeare the primary

law of sonnet harmony, from which he hardly ever varies. In some twenty-seven sonnets the chief pause comes at the end of the eighth line. In a very few it comes irregularly. But in over two-thirds of Shakespeare's sonnets the chief pause is placed after the twelfth line, at the close of three quatrains which are themselves divided by distinct but less emphatic pauses. . . .

[P. 4] Normally, the couplet in a Shakespearean sonnet gives the moral or conclusion toward which the previous twelve lines have been pointing, and compacts into itself the true essence of the poem. This is true in perhaps ninety of the sonnets. Less often the couplet introduces a surprise or negation which suddenly swings the reader into a point of view antithetical to that developed in the quatrains. The cases are very few in which the couplet is content merely to add another idea or illustration.

The couplet has, then, most often the function of a seed-pod, holding in briefer and unflowered form the idea which the quatrains have more gorgeously expanded. Climax is seldom its purpose, and its effect is usually to bring the poem to rest on a note of sincere and simple verity. In the linked sonnets it often happens that the couplet of one serves as the germinal principle of the next.

The language of Shakespeare's sonnets is perhaps the simplest by which any English poet has achieved comparable effects, and in the couplets it is, if possible, simpler than in the quatrains.

H. W. WELLS ("A New Preface to Sh.'s Sonnets," *S. A. B.*, 1937, XII, 128 f.): The fame of Shakspeare's *Sonnets* has been due overwhelmingly to their power simply as love poetry. So they commonly appear in anthologies. Only a small though very fortunate minority of readers discovers in them in a secondary light the address of an Elizabethan dramatist to his patron. The successful artificiality of the sequence is measured by the fact that over four-fifths of all the sonnets, and more than nine-tenths of the most famous ones, are addressed directly to the friend, and the small remainder nominally addressed to the dark lady. Even as love poems those to the noble patron surpass those to the woman. Shakspeare's *Sonnets* should therefore be regarded as allegories no less than *The Vita Nuova*, *The Divine Comedy*, *Piers Plowman* or *The Faerie Queene*. For they are continually alive on two levels. On one level is the humble, jealous, devoted poet addressing his patron, on the other is the heart of man addressing the opposite sex in all the ecstasy and bitterness, fancy and frivolity of love.

Shakspeare's union of realism in both levels or phases of allegorical writing is by no means unprecedented. It occurs, for example, whenever a tale of a distant past is told as an analog to incidents of a critical present. But such writing brought a new tang into English sonneteering, and, we may even add, into English poetry. Although Shakspeare's verbal technique in the *Sonnets* becomes obviously most artificial and even rhetorical, this basic realism places him even as a poet in the van of such great realists as Donne, Jonson, Webster and Middleton, and marks his divorce from the platonic school of English poetry led by Spenser and ornamented by Sidney, Daniel, Constable, Drummond and the many poets who incidentally turned their hand to amorous sonnet writing. Others wrote of Stella, Delia, Idea—Shakspeare wrote of real

men and women in strikingly intimate situations, discarding theory, embracing fact, and concealing only the prosaic data of names, times and places.

As a result Shakspeare's *Sonnets* become profoundly real- [p. 129] istic, and yet obscure in their many allusions which the imaginative reader is invited to expound as best he may. To enjoy the poems we must have a keen sense for reality, and yet a love for poetic suggestion. No one who objects to veiled allusions should ever read Shakspeare's *Sonnets*. This explains why they were consistently and sensibly neglected by Pope, Johnson and the great majority of critics in the eighteenth century. . . .

Poets and the public have long loved Shakspeare's *Sonnets*, while literal-minded readers, no matter how learned, must of necessity miss their meaning. The latter miss the overtones, and of overtones, even more richly than most true poetry, Shakspeare's *Sonnets* are "all compact." To the student of poetic art this must always remain their salient characteristic.

SIR DENYS BRAY (ed. 1938, pp. 44 f.): Neither in the theme nor in the stock variations on it was there much scope for originality, and trammelled by the uniformity of his subject-matter he sought escape from monotony through diversity in the form. Here ingenuity had full play. He could exercise it as much over the structure of the individual sonnet as over the run of his sequence. For the whole sonnet was still in the making. Gascoigne, it is true, had defined it as early as 1575 as 'a poem of fourteen lines, every line containing ten syllables, the first twelve rhyming in staves of four lines by cross-metre, and the last two rhyming together.' But though a fair description of its form on its first appearance and in its later development, this gives an altogether false impression of uniformity in the Elizabethan sequence. In Spenser's *Amoretti* there is only one sonnet that conforms to Gascoigne's standards; in Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella* there is none. Both still struggled with the elaborate rhyme-structure of the Petrarchan sonnet, securing variety by reproducing—not without licence, but within the classic five-rhyme limit—the various forms of their foreign models. The standard Elizabethan sonnet came into its own with the growing popularity of Daniel's *Delia*; yet even *Delia* is interspersed with experiments in the classic style. Over the length of the sonnet there was more uniformity: quatorzain, or fourteen, became indeed the fashionable word for a sonnet. Yet Barnes favoured fifteen lines; Tofte alternated between twelve and ten throughout; and W. Smith interrupted the regular flow of his Elizabethan sonnets with a sonnet of twenty-six lines and another of six rhyming couplets. Even the length of the line came in for experimentation. . . .

[P. 45] From the wilder eccentricities Shakespeare happily held himself aloof, though he comes dangerously near them in the Will sonnets. But there is experimentation even in Shakespeare. Though he ordinarily conforms to Gascoigne's standards, three of his sonnets break the rule for the rhyme-structure or the number of the lines or the length of the line. Like W. Smith, he has a sonnet in rhyming couplets. Like Barnes, he has a sonnet of fifteen lines, and like W. Smith a sonnet of twelve. Like Lodge, he has a sonnet in eight-syllabled verse. And the first and the last of the Youth sonnets are studies in feminine rhymes, an affectation possibly caught from Daniel, who tells us how he struggled later to rid himself of all admixture of it.

J. C. RANSOM (*World's Body*, 1938, pp. 273, 276, 278 f., 284-287, 300, 303): [The sonnets] use the common English metrical pattern, and the metrical work is always admirable, but the logical pattern more often than not fails to fit it. If it be said that you do not need to have a correspondence between a poet's metrical pattern and his logical one, I am forced to observe that Shakespeare thought there was a propriety in it; often he must have gone to the pains of securing it, since it is there and, considering the extreme difficulty of the logical structure in the English sonnet, could not have got in by a happy accident. The metrical pattern of any sonnet is directive. If the English sonnet exhibits the rhyme-scheme ABAB CDCD EFEF GG, it imposes upon the poet the following requirement: that he write three co-ordinate quatrains and then a couplet which will relate to the series collectively.

About a third of the sonnets of Shakespeare are fairly unexceptionable in having just such a logical structure. About half of them might be said to be tolerably workmanlike in this respect; and about half of them are seriously defective. . . .

[P. 276] It is only a large minority of Shakespeare's sonnets in which we can find this perfect adaptation of the logic to the metre. In the others we can find the standard metrical organization, and then some arbitrary logical organization which clashes with it. At least twice we find only fourteen-line poems, with no logical organization at all except that they have little couplet conclusions: in LXVI, "Tir'd with all these, for restful death I cry," and in CXXIX, "The expense of spirit in a waste of shame." Occasionally, as in LXIII, "Against my love shall be, as I am now," the sonnet divides frankly into octave and sextet, so far as the logic goes, though it does not follow that an honest printer has set it up just so. . . .

[P. 278] Probably Shakespeare's usual structural difficulty consists about equally in having to pad out his quatrains, if three good co-ordinates do not offer themselves, and in having to squeeze the couplet too flat, or else extend its argument upward into the proper territory of the quatrains. But when both these things happen at once, the obvious remark is that the poet should have reverted to the Italian sonnet.

Structurally, Shakespeare is a careless workman. But probably, with respect to our attention to structure, we are careless readers. . . .

[P. 279] There is probably a poetry of the feelings just as much as there is a poetry of knowledge; for we may hardly deny to a word its common usage, and poetry is an experience so various as to be entertained by everybody. But the poetry of the feelings is not the one that the critic is compelled to prefer, especially if he can say that it taints us with subjectivism, sentimentality, and self-indulgence. This is the poetry, I think, which we sometimes dispose of a little distastefully as "romantic." It does not pursue its object with much zeal, and it is so common that it involves in a general disrepute all poets, the innocent as well as the guilty, by comparison with those importunate pursuers, the scientists—who will not exactly be expected to fail to make the most of the comparison.

This sort of poetry, I am afraid, is as natural to Shakespeare as language is, and he is a great master in it. . . .

[P. 284] There are certainly sonnets of Shakespeare's in this romantic vein

which are without absurdities, structural defects, and great violences, and which are also compact, that is, without excessive dispersion in the matter of the figures; and they are doubtless the best sonnets of the kind there could possibly be. It would be presumptuous to deny this general type of poetry, or Shakespeare's occasional mastery of it.

Those perfect sonnets are not many. It is not a wild generalization, when we look at the sonnets, to say that Shakespeare was not habitually a perfectionist; [p. 285] he was not as Ben Jonson, or Marvell, or Milton, and he was not as Pope. . . .

The sonnets are mixed in effect. Not only the sequence as a whole but the individual sonnet is uneven in execution. But what to the critic is still more interesting than the up and the down in one style is the alternation of two very different styles: the one we have been considering, and the one which we are accustomed to define (following Doctor Johnson) as metaphysical. What is the metaphysical poetry doing there? Apparently at about the time of *Hamlet*, and perhaps recognizably in the plays but much more deliberately and on a more extended scale in the sonnets, Shakespeare goes metaphysical. Not consistently, of course.

So far as I know, Shakespeare has not ordinarily been credited with being one of the metaphysicals, nor have specimen sonnets been included in lists or anthologies of metaphysical poems. But many sonnets certainly belong there; early examples of that style. If it was not then widely practised, had no name, and could hardly yet have been recognized as a distinct style, then I would suppose that the sonnets as a performance represent Shakespeare seeking such effects as John Donne, a public if still unpublished wonder, by some curious method was achieving. . . .

[P. 286] The thing which surprises us is to find no evidence anywhere that Shakespeare's imagination is equal to the peculiar and systematic exercises which Donne imposed habitually upon his. None, and it should not really surprise us, if we remember that Donne's skill is of the highest technical expertness in English poetry, and that Shakespeare had no university discipline, and developed poetically along lines of least resistance.

He is upon occasions metaphysical enough, but not so metaphysical as Donne; nor as later poets, Donne's followers, who were just as bold in intention as their master, though not usually so happy in act.

The impulse to metaphysical poetry, I shall assume, consists in committing the feelings in the case—those of unrequited love for example—to their determination within the elected figure. But Shake- [p. 287] speare was rarely willing to abandon his feelings to this fate, which is another way of saying that he would not quite risk the consequences of his own imagination. He censored these consequences, to give them sweetness, to give them even dignity; he would go a little way with one figure, usually a reputable one, then anticipate the consequences, or the best of them, and take up another figure.

The simplest way to define Shakespeare's metaphysical accomplishment would be by comparison with Donne's, which is standard. I have often tried to find the parallel cases where the two poets developed the same figure of speech. But I have always been forced to conclude that these poets do not even in outline or skeleton treat quite the same things; Shakespeare's things

being professionally conventional, and Donne's being generally original. . . .

[P. 300] Is not Shakespeare a very bold and successful contriver of metaphysical effects in his later plays? For the sonnets come before the final period of playwrighting, and it is our common impression that this poet's powers developed steadily to their final climax. . . .

[P. 303] It is not likely that the plays of Shakespeare, even the later ones, can furnish better metaphysical effects than the sonnets do, which deliberately intend them, and in intending them do not have to worry about the peremptory and prior claims of drama.

MARK VAN DOREN (*Shakespeare*, 1939, pp. 12-16): What, then, is the great poet of the sonnets writing about—unmistakably, whether he knows it or not? He is writing about the world, the largeness of which he has perhaps only recently discovered, and his power to release which in a line he may be only now discovering. The sonnets are not, finally, love poems. They are poems. Their subject is the greatest possible subject, existence: beautiful or ugly, near or remote, celestial or domestic, and sometimes so awesome that its force can be no more than hinted at.

On a certain level Shakespeare would seem to be entertained by a variety of subjects satisfactory in themselves. He is clearly in love with the word "golden." He ranges after faraway images: the lion's paws, the fierce tiger's jaws, the [p. 13] long-liv'd phoenix (19). He considers the stars in their secret influence on the shows of men (15), and he looks forward to the crooked eclipses that foreshadow death (60). Music, the theater, the law, the state of the times—these hold him here and there. And human life has caught his eye: the painful warrior (25), the decrepit father who takes delight in his active child (37), the rider of a tired horse (50, 51), the fancier of hawks and hounds (91), the dyer's hand (111), the misery of lust (129), the transparent deceptions of lovers (138), sick men (140, 147), the careful housewife with her babe (143), and conscience that is born of love (151). The multiplicity of the world has become enormously interesting to the poet of the sonnets.

But on another level there is a single subject. The great single subject of the sonnets is Time, swift-footed, terrible Time that writes death on faces, roots out the work of masonry, fades roses, brings winter after spring, and makes in general the music to which all the world marches groaning to its end. Under the wing of this bloody tyrant (16) Shakespeare has composed the sonnets which the world knows best; in so far as the sequence has unity it is organized about the theme of Time's decay. The deaths of days and seasons, the springing and the withering of plants (and of men as plants), ravaged faces and ravaged shores, the chronicle of wasted time, the poet's own decline and death, the loss of precious friends, woe, loneliness, and doom—these are the grammar of the poet's finest language, a language which he is using to say what has never been said better or with profounder love. For the universe which Time has revealed to Shakespeare is given to the reader in its fullest glory, in rich forms and colors, and to the accompaniment of sounds now as loud as drums but now as gentle as one string, sweet husband to another (8). . . .

[He comments (pp. 14 f.) on "the failure of the couplet" in 30 and 55.

Again (p. 16) in 64.13 f.] not only does the couplet sink into comparative voicelessness, as if one were using it to say what might after all not be true, though it should be said somehow; the twelfth line also falls away, into thinness, into plaintiveness, and into a personal key far other than that in which eleven great lines have been written. It is a fine line in its kind, but what the poem says by placing it where it is—at the end of three sonorous quatrains whose rhythm has set a wave of change roaring across the face of the great world—is that the great world is a very different thing from the little world of any man, and that it is vastly more interesting for poetry.

By so much does the caliber of the sonnets at their best surpass in interest the crux of their occasion. At their poorest they are perhaps quite personal in the biographer's sense of that term. At their richest, when the volume of their sound suggests a deep, an almost subterranean hum of energy coming from the dark center of all the power there is, they may be personal too; but they are personal at such times rather to the artist than to the man. Shakespeare had found his subject. It was the universe, pulsing under change.

HAZELTON SPENCER (*Art and Life*, 1940, pp. 28 f., 34): Shakespeare's sonnets are part of the vogue of Petrarchism in Elizabeth's England; but, like the greatest examples of any art form, they can not be classified so simply as the products of mere talent. First and foremost they are lyric poems by Shakespeare; as such, they frequently transcend the boundaries of genre and school. The French sonneteers had some influence on the vogue; but the fourteenth-century Italian who sang of Laura was still high priest of love and its expression or simulation in verse. Unfortunately, most of Petrarch's imitators were more successful in copying his mannerisms than in communicating his spirit. The Petrarchan "conceit" was worked to death by them. These metaphors, similes, and graphic symbols of emotion are sometimes moving, but too often they are limp and shopworn from endless repetition. Good taste was consistently violated by writers who tried to avoid too frank an indebtedness; ingenuity and cleverness were thought to justify the most farfetched extravagance. To illustrate, there is the conceit that the poet's tears will soften the flinty heart of his mistress, just as drops of water eventually wear away the hardest stone. From Petrarch to Shakespeare, and of course long after, everyone employs that comparison. Perhaps it was lovely once; perhaps it still seemed so when Shakespeare used it. It can not touch us now. We gratefully turn away from Sonnet 46, where Shakespeare's heart and eye are plaintiff and defendant in a jury trial over the legal title in "thy picture's sight," to the anti-Petrarchism of Sonnet 130. . . . [P. 29] If we *remain* away, we shall miss some uncommonly fine poetry, not in Sonnet 46, but in those of its companions in which Shakespeare was able to master convention. . . .

[P. 34] The same passionate and imaginative nature that gives us the great moments of the plays finds no such scope in the sonnet's scanty plot of ground; but it finds a good deal—more, in fact, than most poets have been able to make use of in any genre, concise or discursive. Some of the sonnets are little more than graceful sets of variations on familiar themes for the fashionable instrument. But many are hot from "the burning core," as Emerson called the authentic process of artistic combustion.

ARTHUR MIZENER ("The Structure of Figurative Language in Sh.'s Sonnets," *Southern Review*, 1940, V, 732, 746 f.): Shakespeare's method is . . . fundamentally different from the metaphysical method: where Donne, for example, surprises you with an apparently illogical vehicle which can be understood only if its logic is followed, Shakespeare surprises you with an apparently logical vehicle which is understandable only if taken figuratively. . . .

[P. 746] The pattern which one of Shakespeare's sonnets aims to establish in the reader's mind (using the word in its broadest sense) is not the pattern of logic aimed at by the metaphysical poem; his typical sonnet is rather a formal effort to create in the reader's mind a pattern, externally controlled, very like the pattern of the mind when it contemplates, with full attention but for no immediately practical purpose, an object in nature. Such a pattern is not built simply of logical relations nor does it consist simply of what is in perfect focus; it is built of all the kinds of relations known to the mind, as a result of its verbal conditioning or for other reasons, which can be invoked verbally. The building of a verbal construct calculated to invoke such a pattern requires the use of every resource language as a social instrument possesses, and it involves a structure of figurative language which at least approaches, in its own verbal terms, the richness, the density, the logical incompleteness of the mind.

No one can say how much the effect which a poem may fairly be said to produce can in the ordinary sense have been intended by the poet; apparently a good deal it does is not consciously intended. But unless the best of Shakespeare's sonnets are to be passed off as miraculous accidents, it is difficult to see what grounds there are for supposing that they are the result of following the path of least resistance in contrast to Donne's poems, which Mr. Ransom [*World's Body*, 1938: see above] quite justly claims must be the result of stern intellectual labors. If the structure of figurative language in Shakespeare's sonnets is not an accident, and if its consequences are calculated, in so far as the consequences of any poem may be said to be calculated, then it seems more than probable that their making involved at least as great an effort of the intellect and imagination as the making of Donne's poems.

[P. 747] Mr. Ransom has it that in a formal lyric "the poetic object is elected by a free choice from all objects in the world, and this object, deliberately elected and worked up by the adult poet, becomes his microcosm. . . . It is as ranging and comprehensive an action as the mind has ever tried." It seems to me that Shakespeare's serious sonnets fail, as they do sometimes fail, not because they do not live up to this admirable description of the formal lyric but because they have tried to live up to it altogether too well.

LOUIS UNTERMEYER (in Herbert Farjeon's *Poems of William Sh.*, 1941, I, xviii): If the sonnets are the most personal poems that Shakespeare ever wrote, they are also the most many-mooded. If they are uneven in quality, if they lapse into flatness and verbal trivialities, they express Shakespeare himself with unreserved directness. . . . One may question the "story" embodied in the sonnets and doubt the coherence of the sequence itself; one cannot doubt the depth and intensity. Discard the sonnets that seem too conventional or too wilful; there remain a small treasury of poems which sound the limits of delight and despair. Love and loss, faith and deceit, the agony of lust and the

therapy of music—these are the subjects that serve as counterpoint to the main theme. . . . The poems have the miraculous making power of the genius who shaped them. They create two worlds: the romantic but recognizable world of Elizabethan England, and the bodiless but more permanent world of the imaginative spirit.

J. A. CHAPMAN ("Marching Song," *English Association Essays*, 1943, XXVIII, 13, 15, 17 f.): By *marching song* is here meant poetry that a man has got by heart, and that he 'reads,' passing it repeatedly through his mind, while tramping the country roads. There may be poetry that is fully 'read' only when so 'read,' but the purpose of a man in equipping himself with *marching song* might be, not to 'read' that verse better, but to live his entire life more in the heart of all poetry. . . .

[P. 15] No other English poetry, I have found, makes better marching song than the Sonnets; for they are never dim; are ever new, being full of dramatic life and interest. They are so wise, too; so ripe, so mature. There is Nature in them; all the passion of love; all the divine speech of that passion; and there is so much old-man wisdom. . . .

[P. 17] The Sonnets are inexhaustible; but how surely so can be fully known only to those who have lived close to them. It is neither true that they are 'derivative, artificial, and even academical,' which has been said, though many could be read, in a parodying voice, so as to bring out the derivative, artificial, and academic element in them; nor true, as one, a good reader too, once said to me, that what stands out for a reader of the Sonnets is the amount of repetition in them, their monotony. If they descend to what they descend, they ascend to what they ascend, and who knows quite what the body of them is; as, for instance, if these or those are not such as exercises on a rainy afternoon in a country-house, or even if some of the sonnets are not Shakespeare's own?

They are inexhaustible: a man will not, in one lifetime, take in the whole mind of Shakespeare so expressed. They are full of old-man wisdom. It is the kind of writing that in France might easily have been published as maxims—the *Maxims of Shakespeare*, of which there is an abundance also in the plays. There are maxims for us all; for statesmen and politicians, those whose job, it being the most difficult, it is to be expected should [p. 18] be the worst done; maxims for aging men, for mature women, for young lovers; only nothing, it would seem, for little children.

LIST OF BOOKS AND ARTICLES

Since formal bibliographies of the sonnets have been compiled both by ALDEN (ed. 1916) and by TANNENBAUM (see below), the following list of important or frequently cited works makes no attempt at completeness. In general, books and articles cited only once, reviews, and brief notes in magazines or newspapers are not included. They can be found by references in the General Index. See also at I, xi-xiv, the list of editions referred to and collated.

- Abbott, E. A. *A Shakespearian Grammar*. London, 1870. (Revised and Enlarged Ed.)
- Acheson, Arthur. *Mistress Davenant the Dark Lady of Shakespeare's Sonnets*. London, 1913.
- *Shakespeare and the Rival Poet*. London and New York, 1903.
- *Shakespeare's Sonnet Story 1592-1598*. London, 1922.
- "Trailing the Dark Lady of the Sonnets," *New York Times Book Review*, March 20, 1921, pp. 4, 27.
- Ackermann, August. *Der Seelenglaube bei Shakespeare*. Frauenfeld, 1914.
- Adams, J. Q. *A Life of William Shakespeare*. Boston, 1923.
- Adnès, André. *Shakespeare et la folie*. Paris, 1936.
- Alden, R. M. "The Lyrical Conceit of the Elizabethans," *S. P.*, 1917, XIV, 129-152.
- "The 1710 and 1714 Texts of Shakespeare's Poems," *M. L. N.*, 1916, XXXI, 268-274.
- *Shakespeare* (Master Spirits of Literature). New York, 1922.
- *A Shakespeare Handbook*. New York, 1925.
- Alexander, Peter. *Shakespeare's Life and Art*. London, 1939.
- Alger, W. R. "Shakespeare and Friendship," *Christian Examiner*, 1862, LXXIII, 209-226; "Shakespeare's Sonnets and Friendship," the same, pp. 403-435.
- Allen, Percy. *Anne Cecil, Elizabeth & Oxford*. London, 1934.
- *The Case for Edward de Vere 17th Earl of Oxford as "Shakespeare."* London, 1930.
- "Alvor, Peter." See Herrmann (Burkhard).
- Anders, H. R. D. *Shakespeare's Books* (*Schriften der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, vol. I). Berlin, 1904.
- Anderson, Robert. *The Works of the British Poets*, vol. II. London and Edinburgh, 1792-1793.
- Angeli, Diego. *La Vita di Guglielmo Shakespeare*. Milan, 1934.
- Anon. "The Confessions of William Shakspeare," *New Monthly Magazine*, 1835, XLIII, 1-9, 306-312, XLIV, 319-336, XLV, 47-69. (The third instalment [XLIV, 319-336] was reprinted without credit, but under the heading "Select Essays," in the *New-York Mirror*, August 22, 29, 1835 [XIII, 60-62, 68 f.], and the whole series in the *Philadelphia and Boston Museum of Foreign Literature and Science*, 1835 [XXVI, 281-285, 568-571, XXVII, 289-299, 558-569].)

- "New Views of Shakespeare's Sonnets: The 'Other Poet' Identified," *Blackwood's*, 1884, CXXXV, 727-761, 1885, CXXXVII, 774-800, 1886, CXXXIX, 327-350.
- "Shakspeare's Minor Poems," *Fraser's Magazine*, 1855, LII, 398-411.
- "A Talk about Sonnets," *Blackwood's*, 1880, CXXVIII, 159-174.
- Apperson, G. L. *English Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases*. London, 1929.
- Arber, Edward. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London; 1554-1640 A. D.*, 5 vols. London and Birmingham, 1875-1894.
- Archer, William. "Shakespeare's Sonnets. The Case against Southampton," *Fortnightly*, 1897, LXVIII, 817-834.
- [Armstrong, John.] *Sonnets from Shakespeare*. London, 1791.
- Astrana Marín, Luis. *William Shakespeare*. Madrid, 1930.
- Bab, Julius. *Shakespeare Wesen und Werke*, 2d ed. Stuttgart, Berlin, Leipzig, 1925.
- Bailey, John. *Shakespeare*. London and New York, 1929.
- Baldwin, C. C. ("George Gordon"). *Airy Nothings or What You Will*. New York, 1917.
- Baltzer, A. *Die schönsten Sonette von William Shakespeare*. Wismar, 1910.
- Barnard, E. A. B. *New Links with Shakespeare*. Cambridge, 1930.
- Barnard, Finch. *Science and the Soul*. London, 1918.
- Barnes, Barnabe. *Parthenophil and Parthenophe*. See Lee (*Elizabethan Sonnets*).
- Barnfield, Richard. *Poems*. Fortune Press ed., London, n. d. (1936?).
- Barnstorff, D. *A Key to Shakespeare's Sonnets* (trans. T. J. Graham). London, 1862. (German ed., 1860.)
- Barrett, H. W. "Shakspeare's Sonnets," *American [Whig] Review*, 1847, VI, 304-309.
- Bartels, Adolf. *Einführung in die Weltliteratur*, vol. I. Munich, 1913.
- Bartlett, Henrietta C. "First Editions of Shakespeare's Quartos," *Library*, 1935, 4th series, XVI, 166-172.
- *Mr. William Shakespeare*. New Haven, Connecticut, 1922.
- Barton, A. T. *The Sonnets of William Shakespeare with a Latin Translation by Alfred Thomas Barton*, ed. John Harrower. London, 1923. (1st ed., Latin only, 1913.)
- Barton, Sir D. P. *Links between Shakespeare and the Law*. London, 1929.
- [Barton, T. P.] *Catalogue of the Barton Collection Boston Public Library in Two Parts*. Boston, 1888. (Part I was issued under a different title in 1880.)
- Bates, E. S. "The Sincerity of Shakespeare's Sonnets," *M. P.*, 1910, VIII, 87-106.
- Bathurst, Charles. *Remarks on the Differences in Shakespeare's Versification*, etc. London, 1857.
- Bayfield, M. A. *A Study of Shakespeare's Versification*. Cambridge, 1920.
- Baym, M. I. "Recurrent Poetic Themes," *S. A. B.*, 1937, XII, 155-158.
- Beatty, Arthur. See Wisconsin.
- Beckwith, Elizabeth. "On the Chronology of Shakespeare's Sonnets," *J. E. G. P.*, 1926, XXV, 227-242.

- Beddoes, T. L. *Works*, ed. H. W. Donner. London, 1935.
- Begley, W. E. *Is It Shakespeare?* London, 1903.
- Bekk, Adolf. *Shakespeare. Des Dichters Bild, nach dem Leben*. Paderborn, 1902.
- *William Shakespeare. Eine biographische Studie*. Munich, 1864.
- Benedetti, Anna. "L'Ordine originale dei sonetti di Guglielmo Shakespeare," *Rivista d'Italia*, 1928, XXXI, i, 120-129.
- Berzeviczy, Albert de. "Les Sonnets de Michelange et de Shakespeare," *Revue de Hongrie*, 1914, XIII, 168-183.
- Beyersdorff, Robert. *Giordano Bruno und Shakespeare*. Oldenburg, 1889.
- Beza, Marcu. *Shakespeare in Roumania*. London, 1931.
- Birch, W. J. *An Inquiry into the Philosophy and Religion of Shakspeare*. London, 1848.
- Blades, William. *Shakspeare and Typography*. London, 1872.
- Blatt, W. M. "A New Light on the Sonnets," *M. P.*, 1913, XI, 135-140.
- Bleibtreu, Karl. *Die Lösung der Shakespeare-Frage*. Leipzig, 1907.
- *Shakespeares Geheimnis*. Bern, 1923.
- Boaden, James. *On the Sonnets of Shakespeare*. London, 1837. (Much of this book was first printed in the *G. M.*, 1832, CII, ii, 217-221, 308-314, 407.)
- Boas, F. S. *Shakspeare and His Predecessors*. New York, 1896.
- Bodenstedt, Friedrich. *William Shakespeare's Sonette*. Berlin, 1862. (His 2d ed. appears in his *Gesammelte Schriften*, 1866, vol. VIII.)
- Bødtker, A. T. "A Study in the Colour of Eyes," *Festskrift til Hjalmar Falk*, pp. 350-368. Oslo, 1927.
- Borghesi, Peter. *Petrarch and His Influence on English Literature*. Bologna, 1906.
- Bowden, H. S. *The Religion of Shakespeare*. London, 1899.
- Bradby, G. F. *Short Studies in Shakespeare*. London, 1929.
- Bradley, A. C. *Oxford Lectures on Poetry*. London, 1909.
- *Shakespearean Tragedy*. London, 1904.
- Brae, A. E. "Shakespeare's Sonnets," *Lippincott's*, 1877, XIX, 761 f.
- Brandes, George. *William Shakespeare A Critical Study*, 2 vols. (trans. William Archer and others). New York, 1898. (German ed., 1896.)
- Brandl, Alois. *Shakespeare Leben—Umwelt—Kunst*. Berlin, 1922, 1937.
- Brandl, Alois, and Ludwig Fulda. *Shakespeares Sonette*. Stuttgart and Berlin, 1913.
- Bray, Sir Denis. "The Art-form of the Elizabethan Sonnet Sequence and Shakespeare's Sonnets," *Jahrbuch*, 1927, LXIII, 159-182.
- Bridges, H. J. *Our Fellow Shakespeare*. Chicago, 1916.
- Brooks, Alden. *Will Shakspeare Factotum and Agent*. New York, 1937.
- Brophy, John. *Gentleman of Stratford*. London, 1939.
- Broughton, James. "Shakspeare's Poems," *G. M.*, 1829, XCIX, i, 225 f.
- Brown, C. A. *Shakespeare's Autobiographical Poems*. London, 1838.
- Brown, Henry. *Shakespeare's Patrons & Other Essays*. London, 1912.
- *The Sonnets of Shakespeare Solved*. London, 1870.
- Bucknill, Sir J. C. *The Medical Knowledge of Shakespeare*. London, 1860.
- Budd, T. D. *Shakespeare's Sonnets, with Commentaries*. Philadelphia, 1868.
- Büchner, Alexander. *Geschichte der englischen Poesie*, vol. I. Darmstadt, 1855.

- Bulloch, John. *Studies on the Text of Shakespeare*. London, 1878.
- Burgersdijk, L. A. J. *Shakspeare's Sonnetten*. Utrecht, 1879.
- Busby, Stanhope. *Lectures on English Poetry*. London, 1837.
- Bush, Douglas. *Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry*. Minneapolis, 1932.
- Byvanck, W. G. C. "Reading Shakespeare's Sonnets," *A Book of Homage to Shakespeare*, ed. Sir Israel Gollancz. Oxford, 1916.
- Caine, Sir T. Hall. *Recollections of Dante Gabriel Rossetti*. London, 1882.
- *Sonnets of Three Centuries*. London, 1882.
- Caldwell, G. S. *Is Sir Walter Raleigh the Author of Shakspeare's Plays and Sonnets?* Melbourne, 1877.
- Calina, Josephine. See Nicoll (Josephine Calina).
- Calvert, G. H. *Shakespeare A Biographic Aesthetic Study*. Boston and New York, 1879.
- Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, The*, ed. F. W. Bateson, vol. I. New York and Cambridge, 1941.
- Campbell, John, Lord. *Shakespeare's Legal Acquirements Considered*. London, 1859.
- Campbell, Thomas. *The Dramatic Works of William Shakspeare*. London, 1842. (1st ed., 1838.)
- "The Sonnets of Shakspeare," *New Monthly Magazine*, 1829, XXVI, 577-583.
- Capell, Edward. *Notes and Various Readings to Shakespeare*, 3 vols. London [1779-1783?]. (The third volume is called *The School of Shakespeare*.)
- Carpenter, B. F. "Shakespeare's Sonnets: To Whom Dedicated?" *Catholic World*, 1918, CVI, 496-507.
- Carriere, Moriz. *Die Kunst im Zusammenhang der Culturentwicklung und die Ideale der Menschheit*, vol. IV. Leipzig, 1871.
- *Die Poesie. Ihr Wesen und ihre Formen*, 2d ed. Leipzig, 1884.
- Carter, Thomas. *Shakespeare and Holy Scripture*. London, 1905.
- Cartwright, Robert. *The Footsteps of Shakspeare*. London, 1862.
- *Papers on Shakspeare*. London, 1877.
- Chalmers, George. *An Apology for the Believers in the Shakspeare-Papers*. London, 1797.
- *A Supplemental Apology for the Believers in the Shakspeare-Papers*. London, 1799.
- Chambers, Sir E. K. *William Shakespeare A Study of Facts and Problems*, 2 vols. Oxford, 1930.
- Chambers, Robert. *Cyclopaedia of English Literature*, 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1844.
- Chambrun, Clara Longworth de. *Giovanni Florio*. Paris, 1921.
- *Shakespeare Actor-Poet*. New York and London, 1927.
- *Shakespeare Rediscovered*. New York and London, 1938.
- *The Sonnets of William Shakespeare*. New York and London, 1913.
- *Two Loves I Have*. Philadelphia and London, 1934.
- Chapman, George. *Poems*, ed. Phyllis B. Bartlett. New York, 1941.
- *Works*, ed. R. H. Shepherd, 3 vols. London, 1874, 1875.

- Chapman, J. J. *A Glance toward Shakespeare*. Boston, 1922.
- Chateaubriand, F. A. de. *Œuvres complètes*, vol. VI. Paris, 1867. (The *Essai sur la littérature anglaise* was first published in 1836.)
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. *Complete Works*, ed. F. N. Robinson. Boston, 1933.
- Chiarini, Giuseppe. "Il Matrimonio e gli amori di Guglielmo Shakespeare," *Nuova antologia*, 1890, 3d series, XXVI, 5-33, 438-462, XXVII, 112-139.
- *Studi Shakespeariani*. Leghorn, 1897.
- Clark, Cumberland. *Shakespeare and Psychology*. London, 1936.
- *Shakespeare and Science*. Birmingham, 1929.
- Clarkson, P. S., and C. T. Warren. *The Law of Property in Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Drama*. Baltimore, 1942.
- Clemen, Wolfgang. *Shakespeares Bilder (Bonner Studien zur englischen Philologie, vol. XXVII)*. Bonn, 1936.
- Coleridge, Hartley. "Shakspeare a Tory, and a Gentleman," *Blackwood's*, 1828, XXIV, 570-583. (Reprinted in his *Essays and Marginalia* [London, 1851], I, 113-147.)
- Coleridge, S. T. *Biographia Literaria*, 2 vols. London, 1817.
- *Specimens of the Table Talk of the Late Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, 2 vols. London, 1835. See also Raysor.
- Collins, Arthur. *Letters and Memorials of State, in the Reigns of Queen Mary, Queen Elizabeth, etc.*, 2 vols. London, 1746.
- Collins, J. C. *Studies in Shakespeare*. Westminster, 1904.
- Collison-Morley, Lacy. *Shakespeare in Italy*. Stratford-upon-Avon, 1916.
- Conrad, Hermann (formerly Hermann Isaac). "Anfängerstil und Jugendstil Shaksperes," *Preussische Jahrbücher*, 1914, CLVI, 442-491.
- "Der Freund der Shakspereschen Sonette," *Preussische Jahrbücher*, 1919, CLXXVII, 220-232.
- "Eine neue Methode der chronologischen Shakspere-Forschung. I," *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, 1909, I, 232-248.
- "Shakespeare's Selbstbekenntnisse," *Preussische Jahrbücher*, 1884, LIV, 237-269, 313-329.
- "Die Sonett-Periode in Shakespeare's Leben," *Jahrbuch*, 1884, XIX, 176-264.
- "Wie weit geht die Abhängigkeit Shakespeare's von Daniel als Lyriker?" *Jahrbuch*, 1882, XVII, 165-200.
- "Zu den Sonetten Shakspere's," *Archiv*, 1878, LIX, 155-204, 241-272, LX, 33-64, 1879, LXI, 177-200, 393-426, LXII, 1-30, 129-172.
- Constable, Henry. *Diana*. See Lee (*Elizabethan Sonnets*), Hazlitt (W. C.).
- Conway, Eustace. *The Supernatural in Shakespeare*. Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1932.
- Copin, Alfred. *Les Sonnets de Shakespeare traduits en vers français*. Paris, 1888.
- Corney, Bolton. *The Sonnets of William Shakspeare*. London, 1862.
- Courthope, W. J. *A History of English Poetry*, vols. II, IV. London, 1897, 1903.
- Cowling, G. H. *A Preface to Shakespeare*. London, 1925.
- Craig, E. G. *Books and Theatres*. London and Toronto, 1925.
- Craig, Hardin. *Shakespeare*. Chicago, 1931.

- [Creighton, Charles.] "Shakespeare and the Earl of Pembroke," *Blackwood's*, 1901, CLXIX, 668-683, 829-845.
- Creighton, Charles. *Shakespeare's Story of His Life*. London, 1904.
- Croce, Benedetto. *Ariosto, Shakespeare and Corneille* (trans. Douglas Ainslie). New York, 1920. (Italian ed., 1920.)
- Crosland, T. W. H. *The English Sonnet*. London, 1917.
- Cunningham, Peter. *Specimens of the British Poets . . . by Thomas Campbell*. London, 1841.
- D., Dr. *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. Leipzig, 1854.
- Dam, B. A. P. van, assisted by C. Stoffel. *William Shakespeare Prosody and Text*. Leyden, 1900.
- Danckelman, Eberhard, Freiherr von. *Shakespeare in seinen Sonetten*. Leipzig, 1897.
- Daniel, Samuel. *Poems and A Defence of Ryme*, ed. A. C. Sprague. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1930.
- Dannenberg, Friedrich. "Shakespeares Sonette: Herkunft, Wesen, Deutung," *Jahrbuch*, 1934, LXX, 37-64.
- Darby, Robert H. "The Date of Some Shakespeare Sonnets," *Jahrbuch*, 1939, LXXV, 135-138.
- Davies, Sir John. *Complete Poems*, ed. A. B. Grosart, 2 vols. London, 1876.
- Davies, Randall. *Notes upon Shakespeare's Sonnets*. London, 1927.
- Davis, C. K. *The Law in Shakespeare*, 2d ed. St. Paul, Minnesota, 1884.
- Davis, Horace. "Shakspeare's Sonnets," *Overland Monthly*, 1888, 2d series, XI, 248-259.
- Davis, Latham. *Shake-speare England's Ulysses. . . Dramatized from the Sonnets of 1609*. Seaford, Delaware, 1905.
- Dawson, George. *Shakespeare and Other Lectures*, ed. George St. Clair. London, 1888.
- Decroos, J. *Shakespeare's Sonnetten*. Courtray, 1933.
- Delécluze, E. J. *Dante Alighieri ou la poésie amoureuse*. Paris, 1848.
- Delius, Nicolaus. *Abhandlungen zu Shakspeare*. Elberfeld, 1878.
- *Der Mythos von William Shakspeare*. Bonn, 1851.
- "Ueber Shakespeare's Sonette," *Jahrbuch*, 1865, I, 18-56.
- De Montmorency, J. E. G. "The Mystery of Shakespeare's Sonnets," *Contemporary Review*, 1912, CI, 737-742.
- Deshler, C. D. *Afternoons with the Poets*. New York, 1879.
- Deutschbein, Max. "Individuum und Kosmos in Shakespeares Werken," *Jahrbuch*, 1933, LXIX, 6-26.
- "Die politischen Sonette Shakespeares," *Jahrbuch*, 1940, LXXVI, 161-188.
- Devrient, Otto. *Zwei Shakespeare-Vorträge*. Karlsruhe, 1869.
- "Diary, David." "The Day. . . No. 11," *Port Folio*, n. s., 1806, I, 385-389.
- Dodd, Alfred. *The Personal Poems of Francis Bacon*. Liverpool, 1931.
- *Shakespeare Creator of Freemasonry*. London [1937?].
- Dodge, R. E. N. See Wisconsin.
- Döring, August. *Hamlet. Ein neuer Versuch zur ästhetischen Erklärung der Tragödie*. Berlin, 1898.

- Donnelly, Ignatius. *The Sonnets of Shakspeare*. St. Paul, Minnesota, 1859.
- Douglas, Lord Alfred, *The Autobiography of*. London, 1929.
- Douglas, Lord Alfred. *The True History of Shakespeare's Sonnets*. London, 1933.
- Dowden, Edward. See *Passionate Pilgrim*.
- *Shakspeare* (Literature Primers). London, 1877.
- *Shakspeare: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art*. London, 1875.
- Downing, Charles. *God in Shakspeare*. London, 1890.
- *The Long Desiderated Knowledge of the Life & Personality of Shakspeare*. London [1892?].
- *The Messiahship of Shakspeare*. London, 1901.
- *Shakspeare as Pan-Judge of the World*. Stratford-on-Avon [1913?].
- Drake, Nathan. *Literary Hours*, 3 vols., 3d ed. London, 1804.
- *Shakspeare and His Times*, 2 vols. London, 1817.
- Drayton, Michael. *Works*, ed. J. W. Hebel, 5 vols. Oxford, 1931, 1932, 1933, 1941. (Vol. V contains editorial matter by Kathleen Tillotson.)
- Dubeux, Albert. *Les Traductions françaises de Shakespeare (Études françaises . . . de la Société des Professeurs français en Amérique, vol. XV)*. Paris, 1928.
- Dünwald, Willi. "Shakespeare," *März*, 1916, X, ii, 49-55.
- [Duggan, John.] *Fair, Kind, and True. . . . By Junius, Jr.* Scranton, Pennsylvania, 1896.
- Dunning, E. J. *The Genesis of Shakespeare's Art*. Boston, 1897.
- Dyce, Alexander. *Glossary (The Works of William Shakespeare, vol. IX)*. London, 1867.
- *Remarks on Mr. J. P. Collier's and Mr. C. Knight's Editions of Shakespeare*. London, 1844.
- Eagle, R. L. *New Light on the Enigmas of Shakespeare's Sonnets*. London, 1916.
- Eibisch, Walther, and L. L. Schücking. *A Shakespeare Bibliography*. Oxford, 1931.
- *Supplement for the Years 1930-1935 to A Shakespeare Bibliography*. Oxford, 1937.
- Edward III*. See *Reign (The)*.
- Eichhoff, Theodor. *Unser Shakespeare, Part II*. Halle, 1903.
- Eichler, Albert. "Zur Quellengeschichte und Technik von L. Tiecks Shakespeare-Novellen," *E. S.*, 1922, LVI, 254-280.
- Ellacombe, H. N. *The Plant-Lore & Garden-Craft of Shakespeare*, 2d ed. London, 1884. (1st ed., 1878.)
- Ellis, A. J. *On Early English Pronunciation, Part III*. Early English Text Society, London, 1871.
- Elson, L. C. *Shakespeare in Music*. Boston, 1901.
- Elton, C. I. *William Shakespeare His Family and Friends*, ed. A. H. Thompson. New York, 1904.
- Elton, Oliver. *Modern Studies*. London, 1907.
- Elze, Karl. *Essays on Shakespeare* (trans. L. Dora Schmitz). London, 1874. (Published in German 1865-1874.)

- *William Shakespeare* (trans. L. Dora Schmitz). London, 1888. (German ed., 1876.)
- Emerson, O. F. "Shakespeare's Sonneteering," *S. P.*, 1923, XX, 111-136.
- Empson, William. *Seven Types of Ambiguity*. New York, 1931.
- "They That Have Power," *Tokyo Imperial University Studies in English Literature*, 1933, XIII, 451-469. (This essay was reprinted in his *Some Versions of Pastoral* [London, 1935], pp. 89-115.)
- Eschenburg, J. J. *Ueber W. Shakspeare*. Zurich, 1787.
- Esquerra, Ramón. *Shakespeare a Catalunya*. Institució del Teatre, 1937.
- Evans, Willa McC. *Henry Lawes Musician and Friend of Poets*. New York, 1941.
- "Lawes' Version of Shakespeare's Sonnet CXVI," *P. M. L. A.*, 1936, LI, 120-122.
- Ewig, Wilhelm. "Shakespeare's 'Lucrece.' Eine litterarhistorische Untersuchung," *Anglia*, 1899, XXII, 1-32, 343-363, 393-455.
- Fairchild, A. H. R. *Shakespeare and the Arts of Design*, University of Missouri *Studies*, 1937, vol. XII, no. 1.
- Farinelli, Arturo. "Shakespeares Italien," *Jahrbuch*, 1939, LXXV, 16-35.
- Farr, Henry. "Notes on Shakespeare's Printers and Publishers," *Library*, 1923, 4th series, III, 225-260.
- Figgis, Darrell. *Shakespeare A Study*. London, 1911.
- Filon, Augustin. *Histoire de la littérature anglaise*. Paris, 1883.
- "Les Sonnets de Shakspeare," *Revue des deux mondes*, 5th series, 1901, II, 795-830.
- Finney, C. L. *The Evolution of Keats's Poetry*, 2 vols. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1936.
- Fischer, Rudolf. *Shakespeares Sonette (Gruppierung, Kunstform)*, ed. Karl Brunner. Vienna and Leipzig, 1925.
- Flathe, J. L. F. *Shakspeare in seiner Wirklichkeit*, 2 parts. Leipzig, 1863, 1864.
- Flatter, Richard. *Karl Kraus als Nachdichter Shakespeares*. Vienna [1933].
- *Shakespeares Sonette*. Vienna, 1934.
- Fleay, F. G. *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama 1559-1642*, 2 vols. London, 1891.
- *A Chronicle History of the Life and Work of William Shakespeare*. London, 1886.
- "On the Motive of Shakspeare's Sonnets (1-125)," *Macmillan's*, 1875, XXXI, 433-445.
- *Shakespeare Manual*. London, 1876.
- Fleischer, Ernst (publisher). *An Appendix to Shakspeare's Dramatic Works*. Leipzig, 1826.
- Forbis, J. F. *The Shakespearean Enigma and an Elizabethan Mania*. New York, 1924.
- Ford, H. L. *Shakespeare 1700-1740 A Collation of the Editions and Separate Plays*. Oxford, 1935.
- Formichi, Carlo. *Guglielmo Shakespeare*. Rome, 1928.
- Forrest, H. T. S. *The Five Authors of 'Shake-speares Sonnets.'* London, 1923.

- Forsyth, Ebenezer. *Shakspeare: Some Notes on His Character and Writings*. Edinburgh, 1867.
- Fort, J. A. "The Date of Shakespeare's 107th Sonnet," *Library*, 1929, 4th series, IX, 381-384.
- "Further Notes on Shakespeare's Sonnets," *Library*, 1928, 4th series, IX, 305-325.
- "The Story Contained in the Second Series of Shakespeare's Sonnets," *R. E. S.*, 1927, III, 406-414.
- "Thorpe's Text of Shakespeare's Sonnets," *R. E. S.*, 1926, II, 439-445.
- *A Time Scheme for Shakespeare's Sonnets*. London, 1929.
- *The Two Dated Sonnets of Shakespeare*. Oxford, 1924.
- Frame, Beatrice Barnstorff. *W. Shakespeares Lied an die Schönheit*. Paderborn, 1931.
- Françon, Marcel. *Notes sur l'esthétique de la femme au XVI^e siècle*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1939.
- Franklyn, C. W. "William Shakespeare, Gentleman," *Westminster Review*, 1889, CXXXII, 348-361.
- Franz, Wilhelm. *Shakespeare-Grammatik*, 2d ed. Heidelberg, 1909.
- Frazer, Robert. *The Silent Shakespeare*. Philadelphia, 1915.
- Fréjaville, Gustave. *Les Travestis de Shakespeare*. Paris [1930].
- Friesen, Hermann, Freiherr von. *Shakspeare-Studien*, vol. I. Vienna, 1874.
- *Shakspeare's Sonette*. Dresden, 1869.
- Fripp, E. I. *Master Richard Quynny . . . Friend of William Shakespeare*. Oxford, 1924.
- *Shakespeare Man and Artist*, 2 vols. Oxford and London, 1938.
- Fulda, Karl. *William Shakespeare*. Marburg, 1875.
- Fullom, S. W. *History of William Shakespeare*. London, 1862.
- Furness, Mrs. H. H. *A Concordance to Shakespeare's Poems*. Philadelphia, 1874.
- Furnivall, F. J. "Shakspeare and Mary Fitton," *Theatre*, 1897, XXX, 293-298.
- Gaehde, Christian. *Shakespeare und seine Zeit*. Leipzig, 1931.
- Gätschenberger, Stephan. *Geschichte der englischen Dichtkunst*. London, 1874.
- Garlanda, Federico. *Guglielmo Shakespeare: il poeta e l'uomo*. Rome [1900?].
- Garnier, Charles-Marie. *William Shakespeare. Les Sonnets* (A. Koszul's *Collection Shakespeare*). Paris, 1922.
- Gelbcke, F. A. *Shakespeare's Sonette*. Hildburghausen, 1867. (First issued in *Bibliothek ausländischer Klassiker*, vol. LII, Hildburghausen, 1867; included in *Shakespeare's dramatische Werke*, vol. IX, Leipzig, 1871.)
- Genée, Rudolph. *Shakespeare. Sein Leben und seine Werke*. Hildburghausen, 1872.
- *William Shakespeare in seinem Werden und Wesen*. Berlin, 1905.
- George, Stefan. *Shakespeare Sonnette*. Berlin, 1909. (Another ed., 1931.)
- Gervinus, G. G. *Shakespeare Commentaries*, 2 vols. (trans. F. E. Bunnnett). London, 1863. (German ed., 1849, 1850.)
- Gildemeister, Otto. *Shakespeare's Sonette*. Leipzig, 1871. (2d ed., 1876.)

- Gillet, Louis. *Shakespeare*. Paris, 1931.
- Gissing, Algernon and Ellen. *Letters of George Gissing*. London, 1927.
- Gleichen-Russwurm, Alexander von. *Freundschaft: Eine psychologische Forschungsreise*. Stuttgart, 1911.
- Goedeke, Karl. "Ueber Sonette Shakespeare's," *Deutsche Rundschau*, 1877, X, 386-409.
- Golding, Arthur. See Rouse (W. H. D.).
- "Gordon, George." See Baldwin (C. C.).
- Gould, George. *Corrigenda and Explanations of the Text of Shakspeare*. London, 1881.
- Granville-Barker, H., and G. B. Harrison. *A Companion to Shakespeare Studies*. Cambridge, 1934.
- Gray, Arthur. *A Chapter in the Early Life of Shakespeare*. Cambridge, 1926.
- Gray, H. D. "The Arrangement and the Date of Shakespeare's Sonnets," *P. M. L. A.*, 1915, XXX, 629-644.
- "Shakespeare, Southampton and Avisa," *Stanford Studies in Language and Literature*, ed. Hardin Craig, pp. 143-151. Stanford University, California, 1941.
- "Shakespeare's Last Sonnets," *M. L. N.*, 1917, XXXII, 17-21.
- Greene, Robert. *Life and Complete Works in Prose and Verse*, ed. A. B. Grosart, 15 vols. London and Aylesbury, 1881-1886.
- Greenhill, James, W. A. Harrison, F. J. Furnivall. *A List of All the Songs & Passages in Shakspeare Which Have Been Set to Music*. New Shakspeare Society, London, 1884. (Revised ed.)
- Greenwood, Sir G. G. *The Shakespeare Problem Restated*. London, 1908.
- Gregor, Joseph. *Shakespeare der Aufbau eines Zeitalters*. Vienna, 1935.
- Griffin, Bartholomew. *Fidessa, More Chaste Than Kind*. See Lee (*Elizabethan Sonnets*).
- Griffin, W. H. See Morley (Henry).
- Grillparzer, Franz. *Tagebücher und literarische Skizzenhefte*, vols. V, VI, ed. August Sauer. Vienna, 1924, 1930.
- Groos, Karl, and Ilse Netto. "Psychologisch-statistische Untersuchungen über die visuellen Sinneseindrücke in Shakespeares . . . Dichtungen," *E. S.*, 1910, XLIII, 27-51.
- Guizot, F. P. G. *Œuvres complètes de Shakspeare*, vols. I, VIII. Paris, 1821, 1862.
- *Shakspeare and His Times*. New York, 1852. (1st ed., in French, 1821.)
- Gundolf, Friedrich. *Shakespeare sein Wesen und Werk*, 2 vols. Berlin, 1928.
- *Shakespeare in deutscher Sprache*, 6 vols., 2d ed. (Vol. VI contains three plays, *Venus*, *Lucrece*, and the sonnets.)
- Haberl, Meinrad. *Die Entwicklung des optischen und akustischen Sinnes bei Shakspeare*. Berlin, 1913.
- Häcker, H. *Was sagt Shake-speare?* Berlin, 1896.
- Haines, C. M. *Shakespeare in France*. London, 1925.
- Haines, C. R. "Recent Shakespearean Research," *Quarterly*, 1921, CCXXXVI, 225-243, 1922, CCXXXVII, 1-17.

- Hall, H. T. *Shaksperean Statistics*. Cambridge, 1874.
- Hall, S. C. *The Book of Gems*. London, 1836.
- Hallam, Henry. *Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Seventeenth Centuries*, 4 vols. Paris, 1839.
- Halliwell-Phillipps, J. O. *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare*. Brighton, 1881, London, 1882, 1883, etc.
- Hamer, Enid. *The Metres of English Poetry*. London, 1930.
- Harbage, Alfred. *Sir William Davenant Poet Venturer 1606-1668*. Philadelphia, 1935.
- Harris, Frank. *The Man Shakespeare and His Tragic Life-Story*. New York, 1909.
- *The Women of Shakespeare*. London, 1911.
- Harrison, G. B. *Shakespeare under Elizabeth*. New York, 1933.
- Hart, J. S. "Shakespeare's Sonnets," *Sartain's Magazine*, 1849, V, 153-157, 217-223.
- Hartmann, Erich. *Naturschilderung und Natursymbolik bei Shakespeare*. Leipzig, 1908.
- Hasselkuss, H. K. *Der Petrarkismus in der Sprache der englischen Sonett-dichter der Renaissance*. Münster i. W., 1927.
- Havens, R. D. *The Influence of Milton on English Poetry*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1922.
- Hazlitt, W. C. *Diana: The Sonnets and Other Poems of Henry Constable*. London, 1859.
- *Shakespear*. London, 1902. (The 3d ed., 1908, and the 4th ed., 1912, are called *Shakespear Himself and his Work*.)
- Hebler, Karl. *Aufsätze über Shakespeare*, 2d ed. Bern, 1874.
- Henderson, George. *Petrarca: A Selection of Sonnets from Various Authors*. London, 1803.
- Henry, Fernand. *Les Sonnets de Shakspeare*. Paris, 1900.
- Hense, Carl Conrad. *Shakespeare. Untersuchungen und Studien*. Halle, 1884.
- Heraud, J. A. *Shakspere His Inner Life*. London, 1865.
- Herford, C. H. *A Sketch of Recent Shakesperean Investigation 1893-1923*. London, 1923.
- "A Sketch of the History of Shakespeare's Influence on the Continent," *John Rylands Library Bulletin*, 1925, IX, 20-62.
- "Heron, Robert." See Pinkerton (John).
- Herrmann, Burkhard ("Peter Alvor"). *Die Lösung des Shakespeare-Problems*. Munich and Leipzig, 1911.
- *Das neue Shakespeare-Evangelium*. Hannover, 1907.
- Hessen, Robert. *Leben Shakespeare's*. Berlin and Stuttgart, 1904.
- Hillard, Kate. "On the Study of Shakespeare's Sonnets," *Lippincott's*, 1875, XV, 497-506.
- Hinkle, George. "Shakespeare's" *Poems of 1640*. Stanford University dissertation, 1936. (See also *Stanford University Abstracts of Dissertations for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy*, 1937, XII, 41-46.)
- Hitchcock, E. A. *Remarks on the Sonnets of Shakespeare*. New York, 1865.
- L'Hommedé, Edmond. "Le Secret de Shakespeare," *Revue de Paris*, 1923, II, 171-192.

- *Le Secret de Shakespeare: Les Sonnets*. Paris, 1932.
- Hope, Constance. "Shakespeare and the Song of a Lark," *Month*, 1899, XCIV, 34-45.
- Hosmer, H. L. *Bacon and Shakespeare in the Sonnets*. San Francisco, 1887.
- Hotson, Leslie. *I, William Shakespeare Do Appoint Thomas Russell, Esquire*. . . . London, 1937.
- Housman, R. F. *A Collection of English Sonnets*. London [1835].
- Hudson, H. N. *Lectures on Shakspeare*, 2 vols. New York, 1848.
- *Shakespeare: His Life, Art, and Characters*, 2 vols. Boston, 1872.
- Hugo, F.-V. *Œuvres complètes de W. Shakespeare*, vol. XV ("Sonnets—Poèmes—Testament"). Paris, 1866.
- *Les Sonnets de William Shakespeare*. Paris, 1857.
- Hugo, Victor. *William Shakespeare* (trans. A. Baillot). London, 1864.
- Hunt, Leigh, and S. A. Lee. *The Book of the Sonnet*, 2 vols. Boston, 1867.
- Hutton, James. "Analogues of Shakespeare's Sonnets 153-54," *M. P.*, 1941, XXXVIII, 385-403.
- Ingleby, C. M. *Shakespeare the Man and the Book*. London, 1877. (2 parts, the 2d called *Occasional Papers on Shakespeare*, London, 1881.)
- Isaac, Hermann. See Conrad.
- J., Y. "Shakspeare's Poems," *New Monthly Magazine*, 1823, VII, 470-476.
- Jaggard, William. *Shakespeare Bibliography*. Stratford-on-Avon, 1911.
- Jameson, Anna B. M. *Memoirs of the Loves of the Poets*, 2 vols. New York and Boston, 1833 (1st ed., London, 1829).
- Jente, Richard. *The Proverbs of Shakespeare with Early and Contemporary Parallels*, *Washington University Studies*, 1926, XIII, 391-444.
- Jodelle, Etienne. *Les Œuvres et meslanges poétiques*, ed. Ch. Marty-Laveaux, 2 vols. Paris, 1868, 1870.
- John, Lisle Cecil. *Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences*. New York, 1938.
- Johnson, Jesse. *Testimony of the Sonnets as to the Authorship of the Shakespearean Plays and Poems*. New York, 1899.
- Jones, H. F. *Samuel Butler*, 2 vols. London, 1919.
- Jones, W. A. *Literary Studies*. New York, 1847.
- Jonson, G. C. A. "Shakespeare's Sonnets," *Poetry Review*, 1931, XXII, 274-292.
- Jordan, Wilhelm. *Shakespeare's Gedichte*. Berlin, 1861.
- Jortin, John. *Miscellaneous Observations upon Authors, Ancient and Modern*, vol. II. London, 1732. (Lewis Theobald's conjectures are on pp. 242-250.)
- Jusserand, J. J. *A Literary History of the English People*, vol. III. New York and London, 1909.
- *Shakespeare in France under the Ancien Régime*. London, 1899.
- Kahn, L. W. *Shakespeares Sonette in Deutschland*. Bern and Leipzig, 1935.
- Karpf, Carl. *Τὸ πλὴν εἶναι: Die Idee Shakespeares und deren Verwirklichung*. Hamburg, 1869.
- Kaun, Ernst. *Konventionelles in den elisabethanischen Sonetten mit Berücksichtigung der französischen und italienischen Quellen*. Greifswald, 1915.

- Keller, Wolfgang. *Shakespeares Werke*, 15 vols. Berlin, 1916. (Vol. XV contains *Venus*, *Lucrece*, and the sonnets.)
- Keller, Wolfgang, and Bernhard Fehr. *Die englische Literatur von der Renaissance bis zur Aufklärung*. Berlin, 1928.
- Kellner, Leon. *Shakespeare*. Leipzig, 1900.
- *Shakespeare-Wörterbuch*. Leipzig, 1922.
- "Shakespeares Sonette," *E. S.*, 1933, LXVIII, 57-80.
- Kenny, Thomas. *The Life and Genius of Shakespeare*. London, 1864.
- Kent, Sydney. *The People in Shakspeare's Sonnets*. London, 1915.
- Ker, W. P. *Form and Style in Poetry*. London, 1928.
- Keser, Jean. *Les Passages obscurs de Shakespeare*, ed. L. F. Choisy. Geneva and Paris, 1931. (Keser died in 1924.)
- Kingsford, C. L. *Historical Manuscripts Commission. Report on the Manuscripts of Lord de L'Isle & Dudley Preserved at Penshurst Place*, 2 vols. London, 1925, 1934.
- Kinnear, B. G. *Cruces Shakespearianae*. London, 1883.
- Kittredge, G. L. *Shakspeare An Address*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1916.
- Klein, David. "Foreign Influence on Shakespeare's Sonnets," *Sewanee Review*, 1905, XIII, 454-474.
- Kliem, Hans. *Sentimentale Freundschaft in der Shakespeare-Epoche*. Jena, 1915.
- Knights, L. C. "Shakespeare's Sonnets," *Scrutiny*, 1934, III, 133-160.
- Knortz, Karl. *An American Shakespeare-Bibliography*. Boston, 1876.
- *Shakespeare in Amerika*. Berlin, 1882.
- Koch, Max. *Shakespeares Leben*. Stuttgart and Berlin, 1884.
- König, Wilhelm. "Shakespeare und Dante," *Jahrbuch*, 1872, VII, 170-213.
- "Shakespeare und Giordano Bruno," *Jahrbuch*, 1876, XI, 97-139.
- Körting, G. K. O. *Grundriss der Geschichte der englischen Litteratur*. Münster i. W., 1887.
- Kralik, Richard von. "Shakespeare-Studien. Shakespeares epische und lyrische Dichtungen," *Die Kultur*, 1907, VIII, 385-396.
- "Shakespeares Beziehungen zu Österreich," the same, pp. 3-10.
- Krauss, Fritz. "Die schwarze Schöne der Shakespeare-Sonette," *Jahrbuch*, 1881, XVI, 144-212.
- "Shakespeare und seine Sonette," *Nord und Süd*, 1879, VIII, 226-243.
- *Shakespeare's Selbstbekenntnisse*. Weimar, 1882.
- *Shakespeare's Southampton-Sonette*. Leipzig, 1872.
- Kreyssig, Friedrich. *Shakespeare-Fragen*. Leipzig, 1871.
- "Shakspeare's lyrische Gedichte und ihre neuesten deutschen Bearbeiter," *Preussische Jahrbücher*, 1864, XIV, 91-114.
- *Vorlesungen über Shakespeare, seine Zeit und seine Werke*, 2 vols., 3d ed. Berlin, 1877.
- Kühne, F. G. *Weibliche und männliche Charaktere*, vol. II. Leipzig, 1838.
- L., R. (?Richard Linche). *Diella*. See Lee (*Elizabethan Sonnets*).
- Lachmann, Karl. *Shakespeare's Sonnette*. Berlin, 1820.
- Lafond, Ernest. *Poèmes et sonnets de William Shakspeare*. Paris, 1856.
- Landau, E. *Das Shakespeare-Mysterium*. Berlin, 1930.

- Landauer, Gustav. *Shakespeare dargestellt in Vorträgen*, 2 vols. Frankfurt am Main, 1920.
- Lanier, Sidney. *Shakspeare and His Forerunners*, 2 vols. New York, 1902. (Lectures given in 1879-1880. Sonnets lecture, 1879.)
- Lanz, Henry. *The Physical Basis of Rime*. Stanford University, California, 1931.
- Larbaud, Valery. See Le Brun.
- Latham, Henry. *Sertum Shaksperianum subnexis aliquot aliunde excerptis floribus*. London, 1864.
- Lawrence, B. E. *Notes on the Authorship of the Shakespeare Plays and Poems*. London, 1925.
- Le Brun, Emile. *Shakespeare: Les Sonnets*, with an introduction by Valery Larbaud. Paris, 1927.
- Lee, Sir Sidney. *Elizabethan Sonnets*, 2 vols. Westminster, 1904. (For convenience the sonnet sequences of Barnes, Constable, Griffin, R. L., Lodge, and Watson are quoted from this work.)
- *The French Renaissance in England*. New York, 1910.
- *A Life of William Shakespeare*. London, 1898. (New ed., Rewritten and Enlarged, London, 1915.)
- "Ovid and Shakespeare's Sonnets," *Quarterly*, 1909, CCX, 455-476. (Reprinted in his *Elizabethan and Other Essays*, 1929, pp. 116-139.)
- "Shakespeare and the Earl of Pembroke," *Fortnightly*, 1898, LXIX, 210-223.
- "Shakespeare and the Earl of Southampton," *Cornhill*, 1898, LXXVII (n. s., IV), 482-495.
- Legouis, Emile, and Louis Cazamian. *A History of English Literature*, 2 vols. (trans. Helen D. Irvine). New York, 1926.
- Leigh, G. A. "The Rival Poet in Shakespeare's Sonnets," *Westminster Review*, 1897, CXLVII, 173-187.
- Lettsom, W. N. See Walker (W. S.).
- Levi, A. R. *Studi su Shakspeare*. Treviso, 1875.
- Lichtenberger, Ernest. *De carminibus Shakesperi cum nova Thorpianae inscriptionis interpretatione*. Paris, 1877.
- Linche (?), Richard. See L. (R.).
- Lodge, Thomas. *Phillis*. See Lee (*Elizabethan Sonnets*).
- Long, Mason. *Poetry and Its Forms*. New York, 1938.
- Looney, J. T. "*Shakespeare*" Identified. London, 1920.
- Lounsbury, T. R. *The Text of Shakespeare*. New York, 1906.
- Lowell, J. R. *Letters*, ed. C. E. Norton, 2 vols. New York, 1894.
- Lucas, W. I. *Die epischen Dichtungen Shakespeares in Deutschland*. Philippsburg, 1934.
- Luce, Morton. *A Handbook to the Works of William Shakespeare*. London, 1906.
- *Shakespeare the Man and His Work*. Bristol and London, 1913.
- Lüdeke, Henry. *Das Buch über Shakespeare . . . von Ludwig Tieck*. Halle, 1920.
- Lyly, John. *Complete Works*, ed. R. W. Bond, 3 vols. Oxford, 1902.
- Lynch, Arthur. "The 'Onlie Begetter' of Shakespeare's Sonnets," *London Review of Reviews*, 1930, LXXX, 307-312.

- M., J. *Ben Jonson on Shakespeare's Sonnets: An Exposition of English*. London, 1914. (Reprints pp. 27-41 of *Shakespeare Self-Revealed*; then adds more details.)
- *A Recantation*. (Being a Supplement to a Book entitled *Shakespeare Self-Revealed*.) No place or date (1909?).
- *Shakespeare Self-Revealed*. London and Manchester, 1904.
- McClumpha, C. F. "Parallels between Shakespere's Sonnets and A Midsummer Night's Dream," *M. L. N.*, 1901, XVI, 164-168.
- "Parallels between Shakspeare's Sonnets and Love's Labour's Lost," *M. L. N.*, 1900, XV, 168-174.
- "Shakespeare's Sonnets and Romeo and Juliet," *Jahrbuch*, 1904, XL, 187-203.
- Mackail, J. W. *The Approach to Shakespeare*. Oxford, 1930.
- *Lectures on Poetry*. London and New York, 1911.
- "A Lover's Complaint," *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, III, 51-70. Oxford, 1912.
- Mackay, Charles. "A Tangled Skein Unravelled, Or the Mystery of Shakespeare's Sonnets," *Nineteenth Century*, 1884, XVI, 238-262.
- Mackenzie, Agnes M. *The Women in Shakespeare's Plays*. London, 1924.
- McKerrow, R. B. *A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England . . . 1557-1640*. London, 1910.
- *Printers' & Publishers' Devices in England & Scotland 1485-1640*. London, 1913.
- McMahan, Anna B. *Shakespeare's Love Story, 1580-1609*. Chicago, 1909.
- McPeck, J. A. S. *Catullus in Strange and Distant Britain*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1939.
- Main, D. M. *A Treasury of English Sonnets*. Manchester, 1880.
- Malone, Edmond. *An Inquiry into the Authenticity of Certain Miscellaneous Papers*. London, 1796.
- Marchi, Luigi de. *I Sonetti di Shakespeare*. Milan, 1891.
- Marie, Aristide. *A la recherche de Shakespeare*. Paris, 1924.
- Marlowe, Christopher. *Poems*, ed. L. C. Martin. London, 1931.
- Marschall, Wilhelm. *Aus Shakespeares poetischem Briefwechsel*. Heidelberg, 1926.
- "Problematisches in Shakespeares Sonetten," *E. S.*, 1929, LXIII, 334 f.
- "Shakespeares Orthographie," *Anglia*, 1927, LI, 307-322.
- "Das Zentralproblem der Shakespeare-Sonette," *Anglia*, 1927, LI, 31-38.
- Martínez, E. J. *Shakespeare en España*. Madrid, 1918.
- [Massey, Gerald.] "Art. V" [on 'Shakspeare and his Sonnets'], *Quarterly*, 1864, CXV, 430-481.
- Masson, David. *Autobiography of Shakespeare from His Thirty-fourth to his thirty-ninth year, derived from His Sonnets Together with the Sonnets themselves arranged & elucidated*. (Two manuscript vols., about 1846, now in the Folger Shakespeare Library.)
- *Essays Biographical and Critical*. Cambridge, 1856.
- *Shakespeare Personally*, ed. Rosaline Masson. London, 1914. (Lectures given about 1895.)

- Mathew, Frank. *An Image of Shakespeare*. London, 1922.
- Mattingly, Garrett. "The Date of Shakespeare's Sonnet CVII," *P. M. L. A.*, 1933, XLVIII, 705-721.
- Mauntz, Alfred von. "Einige Glossen zu Shakespeare's Sonett 121," *Anglia*, 1896, XIX, 291-296.
- *Gedichte von William Shakespeare*. Berlin [1894].
- *Heraldik in Diensten der Shakespeare-Forschung*. Berlin, 1903.
- "Shakespeare's lyrische Gedichte," *Jahrbuch*, 1893, XXVIII, 274-331.
- Meissner, Johannes. *Jung-Shakespeare*. Vienna, 1914.
- Meissner, Paul, "Renaissance und Humanismus im Rahmen der national-englischen Kulturidee," *Jahrbuch*, 1937, LXXIII, 9-30.
- Mézières, Alfred. *Shakspeare ses œuvres et ses critiques*. Paris, 1860.
- Michelagnoli, Alfredo. *Il Sonetto nella letteratura inglese*. Padua, 1938.
- Mills, L. J. *One Soul in Bodies Twain*. Bloomington, Indiana, 1937.
- Milton, John. *Complete Poetical Works*, ed. W. V. Moody. Boston and New York, 1899.
- Minto, William. *Characteristics of English Poets from Chaucer to Shirley*. Edinburgh, 1874.
- Mitchell, C. B. *The English Sonnet in the Seventeenth Century Especially after Milton*. Harvard University dissertation (MS.), 1939.
- Mizener, Arthur. "The Structure of Figurative Language in Shakespeare's Sonnets," *Southern Review*, 1940, V, 730-747.
- Morgan, Appleton. *Shakespeare in Fact and in Criticism*. New York, 1888.
- *Some Shakespearean Commentators*. Cincinnati, 1882.
- "What Meres Knew about Shakespeare's Sonnets," *Catholic World*, 1918, CVII, 235-246.
- "Whose Sonnets?" *Manhattan*, 1884, III, 441-451.
- Morley, Christopher, prefacer. *The Complete Works of Shakespeare. . . Illustrated by Rockwell Kent*. New York, 1936.
- Morley, Edith J. *Henry Crabb Robinson on Books and Their Writers*, 3 vols. London, 1938.
- Morley, Henry, and W. H. Griffin. *Shakespeare and His Time (English Writers, vol. XI)*. London, 1895.
- Morsbach, Lorenz. "Die Sonette Shakespeare's im Lichte der Überlieferung," *Nachrichten von der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse*, 1915, pp. 136-166. (An address delivered July 7, 1912.)
- Muir, Kenneth, and Sean O'Loughlin. *The Voyage to Illyria*. London, 1937.
- Munro, John. *The Shakspeare Allusion-Book*, 2 vols. London and New York, 1909. (The same, reissued with an introduction by Sir E. K. Chambers, 2 vols., Oxford, 1932.)
- Murry, J. M. "Concerning Sonnet 107," *New Adelphi*, 1929, II, 251-254.
- *Countries of the Mind* [1st series]. London, 1922; 2d series, London, 1931.
- *Shakespeare*. London, 1936.
- "Shakespeare's Dedication," *Adelphi*, 1931, II, 199-213.
- Nares, Robert. *A Glossary; or, Collection of Words*. London, 1822.

- Nashe, Thomas. *Works*, ed. R. B. McKerrow, 5 vols. London, 1910.
- Naylor, E. W. *The Poets and Music*. London and Toronto, 1928.
- *Shakespeare and Music*. London, 1896. (New ed., London, 1931.)
- Neal, Thomas. "Chi fu l'amico di Shakespeare," *Il Marzocco*, December 19, 1897, p. 3.
- Neidhardt, Alexander. *Shakespeare's kleinere Dichtungen*. Berlin, 1870.
- Neil, Samuel. *Shakespeare A Critical Biography*. London, 1861.
- Neilson, W. A., and A. H. Thorndike. *The Facts about Shakespeare*. New York, 1913.
- Neri, Ferdinando. *Saggi di letteratura italiana, francese, inglese*. Naples [1936].
- Ness, F. W. *The Use of Rhyme in Shakespeare's Plays*. New Haven, Connecticut, 1941.
- Nethercot, A. H. *Sir William D'Avenant Poet Laureate and Playwright-Manager*. Chicago, 1938.
- Newdigate-Newdegate, Lady. *Gossip from a Muniment Room*. London, 1897. (2d ed., 1898.)
- Nicoll, Josephine Calina. *Shakespeare in Poland*. Shakespeare Association, London, 1923.
- Nisbet, Ulric. *The Onlie Begetter*. London and New York, 1936.
- Noble, J. A. "The Sonnet in England," *Contemporary Review*, 1880, XXXVIII, 446-471. (Reprinted in his book, *The Sonnet in England & Other Essays*, London, 1893.)
- Noble, Richmond. *Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge*. London, 1935.
- Noyes, Alfred. *New Essays and American Impressions*. New York, 1927. (Contains an essay first published as "The Origin of Shakespeare's Sonnets" in the *London Bookman*, 1924, LXVII, 159-162.)
- Nulli, S. A. *Shakespeare in Italia*. Milan, 1918.
- O'Connor, W. D. *Hamlet's Note-Book*. Boston and New York, 1886.
- Østerberg, V. "The 'Countess Scenes' of 'Edward III,'" *Jahrbuch*, 1929, LXV, 49-91.
- Ogle, M. B. "The Classical Origin and Tradition of Literary Conceits," *American Journal of Philology*, 1913, XXXIV, 125-152.
- "The 'White Hand' as a Literary Conceit," *Sewanee Review*, 1912, XX, 459-469.
- Oliphant, E. H. C. "Sonnet Structure: An Analysis," *P. Q.*, 1932, XI, 135-148.
- Olivieri, Angelo. *I Sonetti di William Shakspeare*. Palermo, 1890.
- Onions, C. T. *A Shakespeare Glossary*. Oxford, 1911.
- Ord, Hubert. *Chaucer & the Rival Poet in Shakespeare's Sonnets*. London and Toronto, 1921.
- *London Shown by Shakespeare*. London, 1916.
- Ortlepp, Ernst. *Nachträge zu Shakspeare's Werken*, vol. III. Stuttgart, 1840.
- Otis, J. F. "Something on Sonnets," *Southern Literary Messenger*, 1838, IV, 130-132.
- Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. See Rouse.
- Owen, D. E. *Relations of the Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences to Earlier English Verse*. Philadelphia, 1903.

- Palmer, G. H. *Intimations of Immortality in the Sonnets of Shakspeare*. Boston and New York, 1912.
- Par, Alfonso. *Shakespeare en la literatura española*, 2 vols. Madrid and Barcelona, 1935.
- *Vida de Guillem Shakespeare*. Barcelona, 1916.
- Parrott, T. M. *William Shakespeare A Handbook*. New York, Chicago, etc., 1934.
- *Shakespeare*. New York, 1938.
- Parrott, T. M., Edward Hubler, and R. S. Telfer. *Shakespeare Twenty-Three Plays and the Sonnets*. New York, Chicago, etc., 1938.
- Passionate Pilgrim, The* [1st ed., 1599], by *William Shakespeare*. Facsimile reproduction with an introduction by J. Q. Adams. New York and London, 1939.
- [2d ed., 1599]. Facsimile reproduction by William Griggs, with an introduction by Edward Dowden. London, n. d. (1883).
- Paul, H. N. *Editions of the Collected Works of Shakespeare Published in the United States. 1795-1865*. (Folger Shakespeare Library MS.)
- Pearson, Lu Emily. *Elizabethan Love Conventions*. Berkeley, California, 1933.
- Pember, F. W. *Musa feriata*. Oxford, 1931.
- Pemberton, Henry, Jr. *Shakspeare and Sir Walter Raleigh*. Philadelphia and London, 1914.
- Pennink, Renetta. *Nederland en Shakespeare*. The Hague, 1936.
- Petrarca, Francesco. *Le Rime*, ed. G. S. Cozzo. Florence, 1904.
- Phelps, W. L. "Notes on Shakespeare," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 1939, LXXXI, 573-579.
- Phillips, G. W. *Lord Burghley in Shakespeare . . . and Others*. London, 1936.
- *Shakespeare's Sonnets*. Oxford, 1934.
- *Sunlight on Shakespeare's Sonnets*. London, 1935.
- *The Tragic Story of "Shakespeare."* London, 1932.
- Pierce, F. E. (with H. N. MacCracken and W. H. Durham). *An Introduction to Shakespeare*. New York, 1910.
- Pinkerton, John ("Robert Heron"). *Letters of Literature*. London, 1785.
- Platen-Hallermünde, August, Graf von. *Die Tagebücher*, ed. G. von Laubmann and L. von Scheffler, 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1896, 1900.
- Platt, Arthur. "'Edward III' and Shakespeare's Sonnets," *M. L. R.*, 1911, VI, 511-513.
- Plumptre, E. H. "Shakespeare's Travels: Somerset and Elsewhere," *Contemporary Review*, 1889, LV, 584-602.
- Pollard, A. W. *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates*. London, 1917.
- Pollard, A. W., and G. R. Redgrave. *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books . . . 1475-1640*. London, 1926.
- Pongs, Hermann. *Das Bild in der Dichtung*, vol. I. Marburg, 1927.
- Popović, Vladeta. *Shakespeare in Serbia*. Shakespeare Association, London, 1928.
- Praz, Mario. *Storia della letteratura inglese*. Florence, 1937.
- Price, L. M. *English > German Literary Influences*. University of California Publications in Modern Philology, 1919, 1920, vol. IX.

- Price, T. R. "The Technic of Shakspeare's Sonnets," *Studies in Honor of Basil L. Gildersleeve*, pp. 363-375. Baltimore, 1902.
- "Pudor, Proh." "On Shakspeare's Sonnets," *Blackwood's*, 1818, III, 585-588. (Perhaps by "Christopher North," or John Wilson: see p. 134 n., above.)
- R., M. "Shakspeare," *London and Westminster Review*, 1836, XXVI, 16-31.
- Raleigh, Sir Walter. *Shakespeare*. London, 1907.
- Ralli, Augustus. *A History of Shakespearian Criticism*, 2 vols. London, 1932.
- Rang, F. C. "Freundschaft," "Vom Weltbuch der Person," *Die Kreatur*, 1926-1927, I, 200-213, 268-289.
- Ransom, J. C. *The New Criticism*. Norfolk, Connecticut, 1941.
- *The World's Body*. New York, 1938. ("Shakespeare at Sonnets" was first printed in the *Southern Review*, 1938, III, 531-553.)
- Raysor, T. M. *Coleridge's Miscellaneous Criticism*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1936.
- *Coleridge's Shakespearean Criticism*, 2 vols. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1930.
- Redin, Mats. "The Friend in Shakespeare's Sonnets," *E. S.*, 1922, LVI, 390-407.
- Reed, Henry. *Lectures on the British Poets*, 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1857.
- Regis, Gottlob. *Shakspeare-Almanach*. Berlin, 1836.
- Reichel, Eugen. "Das Porträt des Herrn W. H.," *Die Gegenwart*, 1902, LXII, 250 f.
- *Shakespeare-Litteratur*. Stuttgart, 1887.
- Reign, The, of King Edward the Third*, 1596, ed. J. S. Farmer (Tudor Facsimile Texts), London, 1910; ed. G. C. Moore Smith, London, 1897.
- Reimer, Hans. *Der Vers in Shakespeares nicht-dramatischen Werken*. Bonn, 1908.
- Rendall, G. H. *Personal Clues in Shakespeare Poems & Sonnets*. London, 1934.
- *Shake-speare: Handwriting and Spelling*. London, 1931.
- *Shakespeare Sonnets and Edward de Vere*. London, 1930.
- [Rice, Sir Robert.] *The Story of Hamlet and Horatio*. London, 1924.
- Richardson, D. L. *Literary Leaves or Prose and Verse Chiefly Written in India*, 2 vols., 2d ed. London, 1840.
- "On Shakspeare's Sonnets, Their Poetical Merits, and on the Question to Whom They Are Addressed," *G. M.*, 1835, n. s., IV, 250-256, 361-369.
- Richter, Helene. *Shakespeare der Mensch*. Leipzig, 1923.
- *Shakespeares Gestalten (Die Neueren Sprachen, Beiheft 18)*. Marburg, 1930.
- Rick, Leo. "Shakespeare und Ovid," *Jahrbuch*, 1919, LV, 35-53.
- Riding, Laura, and Robert Graves. *A Survey of Modernist Poetry*. London, 1927.
- Ridley, M. R. *William Shakespeare A Commentary*. London, 1936.
- Ritter, Albert. *Der unbekannte Shakespeare*. Berlin, 1922.
- Robertson, J. G. "Shakespeare on the Continent," *C. H. E. L.*, V, 315-343. New York, 1910.
- Robertson, J. M. *The Genuine in Shakespeare*. London, 1930.

- *An Introduction to the Study of the Shakespeare Canon*. London, 1924.
- *Montaigne and Shakspeare*. London, 1897. (2d ed., 1909.)
- *The Problems of the Shakespeare Sonnets*. London, 1926.
- *Shakespeare and Chapman*. London, 1917.
- Roe, J. E. *Sir Francis Bacon's Own Story*. Rochester, New York, 1918.
- Roedder, Paul. *Shakespeares Sonette im Lichte der neueren Forschungen*. Gollnow, 1913.
- Roffe, Alfred. *The Handbook of Shakespeare Music*. London, 1878.
- Rolfe, W. J. *A Life of William Shakespeare*. Boston, 1904.
- Ronsard, Pierre de. *Œuvres complètes*, ed. Hugues Vaganay, 7 vols. Paris, 1923, 1924.
- Root, R. K. *Classical Mythology in Shakespeare*. New York, 1903.
- Ross, George. *Studies: Biographical and Literary*. London [1867].
- Ross, William. *The Story of Anne Whateley and William Shaxpere as revealed by "The Sonnets to Mr. W. H." and other Elizabethan Poetry*. Glasgow, 1939.
- Rouse, W. H. D., ed. *Shakespeare's Ovid Being Arthur Golding's Translation of the Metamorphoses*. London, 1904.
- Rubow, P. V. *Shakespeare paa Dansk*. Copenhagen, 1932.
- Rusden, G. W. *William Shakespeare; His Life, His Works, and His Teaching*. Melbourne, 1903.
- Ruud, M. B. *An Essay toward a History of Shakespeare in Denmark*. University of Minnesota Research Publications, No. 8, 1920.
- *An Essay toward a History of Shakespeare in Norway*. Urbana, Illinois, 1917.
- Rylands, G. H. W. *Words and Poetry*. London, 1928.
- Sachs, Dr. "Shakespeare's Gedichte," *Jahrbuch*, 1890, XXV, 148-167.
- Saenger, Eduard. *Shakespeares Sonette*. Leipzig, 1909.
- Saintsbury, George. "Shakespeare: Poems," *C. H. E. L.*, V, 250-263. New York, 1910.
- Sanderlin, George. "The Repute of Shakespeare's Sonnets in the Early Nineteenth Century," *M. L. N.*, 1939, LIV, 462-466.
- Sanfelice, Ettore. "Dei 154 sonetti di G. Shakespeare," *Rivista d'Italia*, 1898, III, 286-317.
- *I 154 sonetti di Guglielmo Shakespeare*. Velletri, 1898.
- Sanford, Ezekiel. *The Works of the British Poets*, vol. III. Philadelphia, 1819.
- Sarrazin, Gregor. *Aus Shakespeares Meisterwerkstatt*. Berlin, 1906.
- "Die Entstehung von Shakespeare's 'Verlorener Liebesmühe,'" *Jahrbuch*, 1895, XXXI, 200-230.
- "Shakespeares Sonette," *Internationale Monatsschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst, und Technik*, 1914, VIII, 1071-1095.
- *William Shakespeares Lehrjahre*. Weimar, 1897.
- "Wortechos bei Shakespeare," *Jahrbuch*, 1897, XXXIII, 120-165, 1898, XXXIV, 119-169.
- "Zur Chronologie von Shakespeare's Dichtungen," *Jahrbuch*, 1896, XXXII, 149-181.
- Schaible, K. H. *Shakespeare der Autor seiner Dramen*. Heidelberg, 1889.

- Scherr, Johannes. *A History of English Literature* (trans. M. V.). London, 1882. [1st German ed., 1854.]
- Schiller, Julius. *Shakspeare als Mensch und als Christ*. Leipzig, 1897.
- Schirmer, W. F. *Geschichte der englischen Literatur*. Halle, 1937.
- "Das Sonett in der englischen Literatur," *Anglia*, 1925, XLIX, 1-31.
- Schlegel, A. W. von. *A Course of Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature* (trans. John Black and A. J. W. Morrison). London, 1846.
- *Sämmtliche Werke*, ed. Eduard Böcking, vol. VII. Leipzig, 1846.
- Schlegel, Friedrich von. *Geschichte der alten und neuen Litteratur*, 2 parts. Vienna, 1815.
- *Lectures on the History of Literature, Ancient and Modern* (trans. J. G. Lockhart), 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1818.
- Schmidt, Alexander. *Shakespeare-Lexicon*, 2 vols. Berlin, 1874, 1875.
- Schmidt, Wolfgang. "Sinnesänderung und Bildvertiefung in Shakespeares Sonetten," *Anglia*, 1938, LXII, 286-305.
- Schneider, Karl. *Neues Zeugnis für Rutland-Shakespeare*. Berlin, 1932.
- Schrader, Hans. *Eschenburg und Shakespeare*. Marburg, 1911.
- Schröer, M. M. A. *Grundzüge und Haupttypen der englischen Literaturgeschichte*, part II. Berlin and Leipzig, 2d ed., 1914.
- Schücking, L. L. *Shakespeare im literarischen Urteil seiner Zeit*. Heidelberg, 1908.
- Scott, Janet G. *Les Sonnets élisabéthains*. Paris, 1929.
- Seccombe, Thomas, and J. W. Allen. *The Age of Shakespeare*, 2 vols. London, 1903.
- Servaes, Franz. *Shakespeare*. Berlin and Leipzig [1906].
- Shahani, R. G. *Shakespeare through Eastern Eyes*. London [1932].
- Shakespeare's England An Account of the Life & Manners of His Age*, 2 vols. Oxford, 1916.
- Shaw, A. C. *An Index to the [Birmingham] Shakespeare Memorial Library*. Birmingham, 1903.
- Shaw, G. B. *Misalliance, The Dark Lady of the Sonnets, and Fanny's First Play. With a Treatise on Parents and Children*. London, 1914.
- Sherzer, Jane. "American Editions of Shakespeare: 1753-1866," *P. M. L. A.*, 1907, XXII, 633-696.
- Shindler, Robert. "The Stolen Key," *G. M.*, 1892, CCLXXII, 70-84.
- Shore, W. T. *Shakespeare's Self*. London, 1920.
- Sidney, Sir Philip. *Complete Works*, ed. Albert Feuillerat, 4 vols. Cambridge, 1912-1926.
- Sieper, Ernst. *Shakespeare und seine Zeit*, 2d ed. Leipzig and Berlin, 1913. (1st ed., 1907.)
- Sievers, E. W. *William Shakspeare. Sein Leben und Dichten*. Gotha, 1866.
- Sievers, Eduard. "Shakespeares Anteil am King Lear," *Anglica*, 1925, II, 173-210 (*Palaestra*, vol. CXLVIII).
- Simon, H. W. *The Reading of Shakespeare in American Schools and Colleges*. New York, 1932.
- Simpson, Percy. *Shakespearian Punctuation*. Oxford, 1911.
- Simpson, Richard. *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Shakespeare's Sonnets*. London, 1868.

- Simrock, K. J. *Shakespeares Gedichte*. Stuttgart, 1867.
- Skottowe, Augustine. *The Life of Shakspeare*, 2 vols. London, 1824.
- Smeaton, Oliphant. *Shakespeare His Life and Work* (Everyman's Library). London [1911].
- Smith, L. P. *On Reading Shakespeare*. London, 1933.
- Smith, W. G. *The Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs*. Oxford, 1935.
- Snider, D. J. *A Biography of William Shakespeare*. St. Louis, 1922.
- Spalding, T. A. "Shakspeare's Sonnets," *G. M.*, 1878, CCXLII, 300-318.
- Spencer, Hazelton. *The Art and Life of William Shakespeare*. New York, 1940.
- Spenser, Edmund. *Complete Poetical Works*, ed. R. E. N. Dodge. Boston and New York, 1908.
- Spira, Theodor. *Shakespeares Sonette im Zusammenhang seines Werkes*. Königsberg, 1929.
- Spurgeon, Caroline F. E. *Keats's Shakespeare*. London, 1928.
- *Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us*. New York, 1935.
- Squire, J. C. *Life and Letters*. London, 1920.
- Stalker, Archibald. *Shakespeare and Tom Nashe*. Stirling, 1935.
- Staunton, Howard. "Unsuspected Corruptions of Shakspeare's Text," *Athenaeum*, January 3, March 14, 1874, pp. 20 f., 357 f.
- Steevens, George. *Twenty of the Plays of Shakespeare*, vol. IV. London, 1766. (Contains the second reprint of Q.)
- Steeves, H. R. "American Editors of Shakspeare," *Columbia University Shaksperian Studies*, 1916, pp. 347-368.
- Stengel, E. "Bilden die ersten 126 Sonette Shakspeare's einen Sonettcyclus, und welches ist die ursprüngliche Reihenfolge derselben?" *E. S.*, 1881, IV, 1-34.
- Sterner, L. G. *The Sonnet in American Literature*. Philadelphia, 1930.
- Steuerwald, Wilhelm. *Lyrisches im Shakspeare*. Munich, 1881.
- Stockdale, Percival. *Lectures on the Truly Eminent English Poets*, 2 vols. London, 1807.
- Stopes, Charlotte C. "The Date of Shakspeare's Sonnets," *Athenaeum*, March 19, March 26, 1898, pp. 374 f., 405 f.
- *The Life of Henry, Third Earl of Southampton, Shakespeare's Patron*. Cambridge, 1922.
- *Shakespeare's Environment*. London, 1914.
- *Shakespeare's Family*. London, 1901.
- "Shakespeare's Sonnets," *Jahrbuch*, 1890, XXV, 185-204.
- "Shakespeare's Sonnets, 'W. H.,' and the 'Dark Lady,'" *Poet-Lore*, 1890, II, 460-480.
- *Shakespeare's Warwickshire Contemporaries*. Stratford-upon-Avon, 1897.
- Stotsenburg, J. H. *An Impartial Study of the Shakespeare Title*. Louisville, Kentucky, 1904.
- "Sidney's Shake-speare Sonnets," *Baconiana*, 1892, I, 53-61.
- "The Sugared Sonnets," *Baconiana*, 1892, I, 19-26.
- Strafforello, Gustavo. *Curiosità ed amenità letterarie*. Florence, 1889.
- Stricker, Käthe. "Dorothea Tieck und ihr Schaffen für Shakespeare," *Jahrbuch*, 1936, LXXII, 79-92.

- Strong, J. R. *Note upon the "Dark Lady" Series of Shakspeare's Sonnets.* New York and London, 1921.
- Stroup, T. B. "Biron and the 116th Sonnet," *P. Q.*, 1931, X, 308-310.
- Suckling, Sir John. *Works*, ed. A. H. Thompson. London, 1910.
- Swinburne, A. C. *A Study of Shakespeare.* London, 1879.
- Taine, H. A. *History of English Literature* [1863] (trans. H. van Laun), vol. I. Edinburgh, 1871.
- Tannenbaum, S. A. "The 'Copy' for Shakspeare's *Sonnets*," *P. Q.*, 1931, X, 393-395.
- *Shakspeare's Sonnets (A Concise Bibliography).* New York, 1940. (*Elizabethan Bibliographies*, No. 10.)
- Tausig, Paul. "Zu Shakespeares Sonetten 153 and 154," *Jahrbuch*, 1904, XL, 231-233.
- Taylor, H. O. *Thought and Expression in the Sixteenth Century*, 2 vols. New York, 1920.
- Ter Haghe, Adolf. "Over de Sonnetten van Shakespeare," *Neophilologus*, 1932, XVII, 289-292.
- Thaler, Alwin. *Shakspeare's Silences.* Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1929.
- Theobald, B. G. *Shake-speare's Sonnets Unmasked.* London, 1929.
- Theobald, Lewis. *See* Jortin.
- Theobald, W. *On the Authorship of the Sonnets Attributed to Shakespeare.* Budleigh Salterton, 1896.
- Thomson, Walter. *The Sonnets of William Shakespeare & Henry Wriothesley Third Earl of Southampton.* Oxford and Liverpool, 1938.
- Thomson, William. *On Renascence Drama or History Made Visible.* Melbourne, 1880.
- Thorn-Drury, G. *More Seventeenth Century Allusions to Shakespeare.* London, 1924.
- *Some Seventeenth Century Allusions to Shakespeare.* London, 1920.
- Thornton, Gregory. *Sonnets of Shakespeare's Ghost.* Sydney, 1920.
- Thurston, Herbert. "The 'Mr. W. H.' of Shakespeare's Sonnets," *Month*, 1930, CLVI, 425-437.
- Tieck, Ludwig [and Dorothea]. "Ueber Shakspears Sonette einige Worte, nebst Proben einer Uebersetzung derselben," *Penelope Taschenbuch für das Jahr 1826* (ed. Theodor Hell, Leipzig), pp. 314-339.
- Tilley, M. P. *Elizabethan Proverb Lore in Lyly's Euphues and in Pettie's Petite Pallace with Parallels from Shakespeare.* New York, 1926.
- Tillotson, Kathleen. *See* Drayton.
- Tirinelli, Gustavo. "I Sonetti di Shakspeare," *Nuova antologia*, 1878, 2d series, VIII, 228-259.
- Toyoda, Minoru. *Shakespeare in Japan.* Tokyo, 1940.
- Travers, S. S. "The Non-Personality of Shakespeare," *Victorian Review*, 1880, III, 253-258.
- *Shakespeare's Sonnets. To Whom Were They Addressed?* Tasmania, 1881.
- Traversi, D. A. *Approach to Shakespeare.* London, 1938.
- Trench, R. C. *A Household Book of English Poetry.* London, 1868.

- Tschischwitz, Benno. *Shakspeare's Sonette*. Halle, 1870.
- Turmann, Margaritha. *Die Farbenbezeichnungen in der Dichtung der englischen Renaissance*. Reval, 1934.
- Turner, Charles Edward. *Our Great Writers*, 2 vols. St. Petersburg, 1864.
- Tyler, Thomas. "The Date of Shakspeare's Fifty-Fifth Sonnet," *Athenaeum*, September 11, 1880, pp. 337 f.
- *The Herbert-Fitton Theory of Shakespeare's Sonnets A Reply*. London, 1898.
- Ulrici, Hermann. *Shakspeare's Dramatic Art* (trans. A. J. W. Morrison). London, 1846. (German ed., 1839.)
- Van Doren, Mark. *Shakespeare*. New York, 1939.
- Viëtor, Wilhelm. *A Shakespeare Phonology*. Marburg and London, 1906.
- Vischer, F. T. *Shakespeare-Vorträge*, vol. I. Stuttgart, 1899.
- Voëge, Ernst. *Mittelbarkeit und Unmittelbarkeit in der Lyrik*. Munich, 1932.
- Voigt, Edmund. *Gegenstände und Verwendung der Naturschilderungen Shakespeares*. Heidelberg, 1908.
- "Wagner, Emil." See Walesrode.
- Wailly, Léon de ("A.-L. W.-B," "Armand Morlaix"). "Sonnets de Shakspeare," *Revue des deux mondes*, 3d series, 1834, IV, 679-697.
- Walesrode, L. R. ("Emil Wagner"). *William Shakspeare's sämtliche Gedichte*. Königsberg, 1840.
- Walker, W. S. *A Critical Examination of the Text of Shakespeare*, ed. W. N. Lettsom, 3 vols. London, 1860. (Walker died in 1846.)
- Walter, James. *Shakespeare's True Life*. London, 1890.
- Walters, Cuming. *The Mystery of Shakespeare's Sonnets*. London, 1899.
- Wanschura, Karl. *Die Sonette Shakespeares von Franz Bacon geschrieben*. Vienna and Leipzig, 1930.
- Ward, Sir A. W. *A History of English Dramatic Literature to the Death of Queen Anne*, 3 vols. London, 1899.
- Ward, B. R. *The Mystery of "Mr. W. H."* London, 1923.
- "Shakespeare's Sonnets," *Poetry and the Play*, Winter, 1929-1930, XIII, No. 87, 19-30.
- Watson, Thomas. *Tears of Fancy*. See Lee (*Elizabethan Sonnets*).
- Wells, H. W. "A New Preface to Shakspeare's Sonnets," *S. A. B.*, 1937, XII, 118-129.
- *Poetic Imagery Illustrated from Elizabethan Literature*. New York, 1924.
- Wendell, Barrett. *The Traditions of European Literature from Homer to Dante*. New York, 1920.
- *William Shakspeare*. New York, 1894.
- Westfall, Alfred van R. *American Shakespearean Criticism 1607-1865*. New York, 1939.
- White, E. J. *Commentaries on the Law in Shakespeare*. St. Louis, 1911.
- White, H. K. *An Index to the Songs, Snatches, & Passages in Shakespeare Which Have Been Set to Music*. Great Fencote, Yorkshire, 1900.

- White, R. G. *Shakespeare's Scholar: Being Historical and Critical Studies of His Text*, etc. New York, 1854.
- White, T. W. *Our English Homer; or, Shakespeare Historically Considered*. London, 1892.
- Wietfeld, Albert. *Die Bildersprache in Shakespeare's Sonetten*. Halle, 1916.
- Wigston, W. F. C. *A New Study of Shakespeare*. London, 1884.
- Wilde, Oscar. "The Portrait of Mr W. H.," *Blackwood's*, 1889, CXLVI, 1-21.
 ——— *The Portrait of Mr W. H. . . . Now First Printed from the Original Enlarged Manuscript*. New York, 1921.
- Wilkins, E. H. "The *Enueg* in Petrarch and in Shakespeare," *M. P.*, 1915, XIII, 495 f.
- Williams, Frayne. *Mr. Shakespeare of The Globe*. New York, 1941.
- Wilson, George. *The Five Gateways of Knowledge*. Philadelphia, 1857.
- Wilson, J. D. *The Essential Shakespeare*. Cambridge, 1932.
- Wilson, Katharine M. "Shakespeare's Sonnets," *Calcutta Review*, 3d series, 1930, XXXVII, 179-197, 1931, XXXVIII, 46-70.
- Winsor, Justin. "Shakespeare's Poems. A Bibliography of the Earlier Editions," *Harvard University Library Bulletin*, I, 207 f., 264-268, 286. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1878, 1879.
- Wisconsin, *Shakespeare Studies by Members of the Department of English of the University of*. Madison, Wisconsin, 1916. (Contains R. E. N. Dodge's "An Obsolete Elizabethan Mode of Rhyming," pp. 174-200, and Arthur Beatty's "Shakespeare's Sonnets and Plays," pp. 201-214.)
- Wolff, Gustav. *William Shakespeare Sonnette englisch und deutsch*. Munich, 1939. (2d ed., title corrected to *Sonette*, Munich, 1939.)
- Wolff, M. J. "Neue Literatur zu Shakespeares Sonetten," *E. S.*, 1916, L, 152-164.
 ——— "Petrarkismus und Antipetrarkismus in Shakespeares Sonetten," *E. S.*, 1916, XLIX, 161-189.
 ——— *Die Renaissance in der englischen Literatur (Neuphilologische Handbibliothek, vol. I)*. Bielefeld and Leipzig, 1928.
 ——— *Shakespeare der Dichter und sein Werk*, 2 vols. Munich, 1907, 1908.
 ——— "Shakespeare und der Petrarkismus," *Die neueren Sprachen*, 1920, XVIII, 193-203.
 ——— *Shakespeares Sonette*. Berlin, 1903.
 ——— *William Shakespeare*. Leipzig, 1903.
 ——— "Zu Shakespeares Sonetten," *E. S.*, 1932, LXVI, 468 f.
- Wollenberg, Robert. *Shakespeare Persönliches aus Welt und Werk (Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Medizin und der Naturwissenschaften, Heft 31)*. Berlin, 1939.
- Wülker, Richard. *Geschichte der englischen Litteratur*. Leipzig and Vienna, 1896. (Another ed. [*Geschichte . . . Literatur*], 2 vols., 1906, 1907.)
- Wyld, H. C. *Studies in English Rhymes from Surrey to Pope*. London, 1923.
- Yates, Frances A. *A Study of Love's Labour's Lost*. Cambridge, 1936.
- Yeatman, J. P. *The Gentle Shakspeare: A Vindication*. London and Birmingham, 1896.

- Yolland, Arthur. "1938-1983: The Cult of Shakespeare in Hungary," *Hungarian Quarterly*, 1939, V, 285-296.
- Young, Frances B. *Mary Sidney Countess of Pembroke*. London, 1912.
- Young, Sir George. *An English Prosody on Inductive Lines*. Cambridge, 1928.
- Young, H. McC. *The Sonnets of Shakespeare: A Psycho-Sexual Analysis*. Columbia, Missouri, 1937.
- Zimmermann, Robert. "Shakespeare's Sonette," *Studien und Kritiken zur Philosophie und Aesthetik*, II, 112-129. Vienna, 1870. (The essay first appeared in 1862.)
- Zocco, Irene. *Petrarchismo e petrarchisti in Inghilterra*. Palermo, 1906.

GENERAL INDEX TO THE
COMMENTARY AND THE
APPENDIXES

GENERAL INDEX

TO THE COMMENTARY AND THE APPENDIXES

"A. E.": see Russell (G. W.)

A., E. S., I, 249

A., R., I, 268

Aaron, Daniel, I, 376

Abbey, Wesley, II, 376 n.

Abbott, Edwin, on Sh.'s grammar

(*q. v.*), I, 7, 13, 16, 20, 27, 38, 42, 53, 67 f., 70, 97, 99, 107, 115, 117, 119, 124, 129 f., 132, 140, 145, 151, 155 f., 166, 171 f., 176, 184 f., 187, 190, 193, 201 f., 205, 207, 211, 213, 218, 227, 231, 236, 242, 273, 289, 292, 303, 312 f., 331 f., 335, 356, 371

abbreviations used, list of, I, xi-xiv, xix

able spirit, that, I, 214, 216, II, 283, 286, 288 f.

absence, the friend's, from London, I, 111, 124, 152, 156 f.; Sh.'s, from London, I, 81, 132, 136, 239, 241, 273, II, 188, 211 f. See travels

absolute construction, I, 256

abstractions, the sonnets deal with, II, 157-165, 214 f., 224 f., 228 f., 272-275. See allegories; interpretations

abuse (=deceive), I, 119; my unkind abuse, I, 342 f.

abysm, profound, I, 283 (cf. II, 185)

Académie Royale de Belgique, *Bulletin*, II, 308

Academy, I, 23, 93, 367, 376, II, 158, 175, 187, 189, 199, 200 n., 206, 222, 261-264, 304, 343

accents, in other, I, 181 f.

accentuation, examples of archaic, I, 16, 49, 70, 84, 97, 101 f., 125 f., 307 f., 327, 347 f., 364, 367. See pronunciation

acceptáble, I, 15 f.

accessary, I, 100, 102

accident, far from, I, 311 f.

account of hours to crave, I, 156

Acheson, Arthur, I, 7 f., 117, 148, II, 47, 58, 69, 74, 185, 187 n., 207, 228, 285, 287 f., 376; rearranges Q, II, 100 ff.; on the Mmes. Davenant,

II, 269 ff., 305-311; on *Willobie*, II, 295 n., 299 n., 305-311

Ackermann, August, I, 88, 268, 373, 380

acknowledge thee, I may evermore, I, 103 f.

acquaintance, strangle, I, 223 f.

acrostics in Q, II, 51, 164, 192, 230; in *Willobie*, II, 295. See anagrams; ciphers; cryptograms

acting, Sh. on the profession of, I, 83 f., 104, 188, 225, 275-282, 304 f., II, 45, 147, 178, 240; his retirement from, I, 309. See actor; actors; boy actors; stage; theaters

action (=vigor), I, 172

actor, Sh. an, I, 105 f., II, 143 n., 147 f., 196, 416; an unperfect actor, I, 65

actors, Puritan insults to, I, 175, 304 f.; Sh.'s company of, II, 236, their tours, I, 77 f., 240, 273, II, 225, and troubles, I, 225; sonnets written to, II, 225. See acting

Adams, J. Q., I, 13, 15 ff., 19, 28, 31, 42, 57, 59, 62, 66 f., 69, 71, 88, 95, 103 f., 108, 111, 114, 117, 125, 135, 139, 153, 173, 184, 194, 196, 199, 201 f., 209, 211, 218, 229 ff., 234, 237, 243, 246, 258, 266 f., 270, 277, 281 f., 284, 300 f., 305 f., 316, 330, 346, 350, 353, 364, 370, II, 55, 69 f., 83, 118, 232, 252, 293, 309, 375

Adamson, Robert, II, 130

adder's sense, my, I, 283 f., II, 428

Addison and Hodson, II, 316 f., 320 f.

Addison and Holber, II, 318

addition, making, I, 344, 347

addressees of the sonnets, main discussions of, II, 76-111, 177 f., 242-250, 277 f.; other comments on, I, 32, 50, 54 f., 65, 78, 93, 104, 106, 132, 143, 152, 155, 183 ff., 203, 221, 231, 247 f., 255, 258, 267, 278, 294, 320, 340, 351, 370, 372, II, 20, 24, 38, 44, 57, 71, 135 f., 167, 170, 181, 208, 215, 222, 224 f., 233, 240, 256-

- 260, 273 ff., 329, 348, 379, 430, *et passim*. See man; men; woman; women
- Adelphi*, I, 209, II, 192
- adjective, causative use of, I, 53; transposition of, I, 35, 38, 242, 281; used as a verb, I, 20
- adjunct, keep an, I, 307 f.
- Admiralty, Lords of the, II, 183
- admire (=wonder at), I, 309 f.
- Adnès, André, II, 70, 238 f.
- Adonis, I, 142 f. See *Venus and Adonis*
- Adrian IV, Pope: see Breakspear
- advance my ignorance, I, 201 f.
- adventurer, well-wishing, I, 3, II, 168 f., 171, 173 ff., 220, 229
- adverbs used as adjectives, I, 140
- adverse party, thy, I, 100, 102
- advised respects, I, 134
- Aeschylus, I, 13, 220, II, 131
- affable, familiar ghost, that, I, 217 f., II, 196, 277, 279, 281-284, 288 f., 291, 428
- affections new, old offenses of, I, 275, 277
- afford (=offer), I, 203, 216
- after-loss, I, 225
- against my love, I, 167 f.; against that time, I, 134
- age, outworn buried, I, 169 f.
- age's cruel knife, I, 167 f., 193, and steepy night, I, 167 f. See old age
- aggravate thy store, I, 374, 378
- Ainslie, Douglas, II, 219 n., 411
- Alamanni, Luigi, II, 62, 127, 241
- "Albert": see Armstrong (John)
- Albrecht, H. C., II, 378
- alchemy, I, 95 f., 289, II, 8 f. n.
- Alden, R. M., I, 6, 8, 10 f., 16, 18, 23, 28, 31, 36, 38, 40, 42, 45, 49, 52, 57 f., 61, 68, *et passim*, II, 5, 17 n., 26-30, 43, 64 f., 70, 74, 86, 98, 100, 102, 118, 131 n., 151, 241, 245, 248, 270, 278, 288, 293, 308, 318 f., 375, 390 n., 412 f.
- alembics, foul, I, 300
- Alexander, B. E., II, 397
- Alexander, E. J. D., fifth Earl of Caledon, II, 2
- Alexander, Peter, II, 192, 195, 221, 265, 282, 365
- Alexander, William, Sir, I, 207
- Alfieri, Vittorio, I, 51
- Alger, W. R., II, 197, 247, 283, 373
- Alice, Sh.'s, II, 393
- alien pen, every, I, 201, II, 9 n., 181, 185, 277, 280, 289
- all (=any), I, 180; all my every part, I, 165; all they (=all that they were), I, 90 f.; all tyrant, I, 383 f.
- allayed, is, by feeding, I, 152
- Allde, John, II, 217
- all-eating shame, I, 10 f.
- allegories, the sonnets as, II, 160-163, 215, 273, 279, 430. See abstractions
- Allen, —, conjecture by, I, 338
- Allen, D. C., I, 39, 242, II, 328 n.
- Allen, J. W., II, 72, 95, 231, 407
- Allen, Percy, I, 265, II, 107, 161 n., 165, 184, 218, 230, 275
- Alleyn, Edward, II, 54
- alliteration, Sh.'s, I, 86 f., 213, 253, II, 291, 418
- all-oblivious enmity, I, 147, 151
- Allot, Robert, II, 193, 197, 328
- allow, my good, I, 283 f.
- All's Well That Ends Well*, I, 9, 17, 38, 42, 70 f., 200, 297, II, 266; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64
- all-the-world, my, I, 283 f., II, 425
- all-too-precious you, I, 217 f.
- Alme, Edvard, II, 396
- altered new, I, 231
- "Alvor, Peter": see Herrmann
- am to, I, I, 156 f.
- Amanda, a reformed whore, the dark woman, II, 267
- ambassage, written, I, 75 f.
- ambiguity, Sh.'s, I, 190. See Empson
- ambush of young days, I, 183, 185, II, 57, 110, 178, 428
- America, first separate edition of Q in, II, 34; first edition of Sh. in, II, 39; vogue of the sonnets in, II, 367-377
- American Bibliographical Society *Papers*, II, 35 n.
- American Foundation for the Blind, II, 376 n.
- American Journal of Philology*, I, 324, 394
- American Journal of Psychology*, I, 87
- American Literature*, II, 367 n.
- American Monthly*, II, 370
- American Philosophical Society, *Proceedings*, I, 18, II, 149, 367
- American Quarterly Review*, II, 369 f.

- American Scholar*, I, 376
American Whig Review, II, 77, 138, 256, 371 ff.
 amiss, bear, I, 158 f.; salving thy amiss, I, 100 f.; urge not my amiss, I, 387 f.
amor divino, II, 241; *amor razionale*, II, 127, 162, 241; *amor sensuale*, II, 127, 241, 254
 Anacreon, I, 63, II, 234
 anagrams in Q, II, 185, 192 n., 203 n., 229, 280; in *Willobie*, II, 270, 308, 309 n. See acrostics
Analytical Review, II, 337
 and, initial repetition (*q. v.*) of, I, 174
 Anders, H. R. D., I, 85, 117, II, 124
 Anderson, C., II, 30
 Anderson, J., II, 40
 Anderson, Robert, II, 337, 344, 347
 angel, my better, I, 368, 370, II, 239 n.
 Angeli, Diego, II, 174 n.
 Angell, Pauline K., II, 312 f.
 Angeriano, Girolamo, I, 394
Anglia, I, 36, 87, 101, 128, 169, 175, 195, 245, 269, 291, 305 f., 355, 369, II, 17, 51, 84, 124, 152, 169, 194, 273, 413. See *Beiblatt*
Anglica, II, 48, 232
Anglo-Italian Review, I, 276
anima mundi, Sh. and the, I, 158, II, 130. See Bruno
 "Ann Hathaway" (song), II, 34 ff. See Shakespeare (Anne)
 Anne, queen of James I, II, 229
 Annesley (Ansley), Cordell, Lady Hervey, II, 219 f.
Annual Review, II, 340, 347
 Ansley, Cordelia: see Annesley
 antique book, I, 158 f., II, 292; antique hours, I, 179 f.; antique pen, I, 52 f., 260 f., II, 351; antique song, I, 48 f., II, 351, 419
 antiquity, makes, his page, I, 271 f., II, 426; tanned (*q. v.*) antiquity, I, 165 f.
Antony and Cleopatra, I, 112, 125, 175, 193, 224, 265, 269, 301, 351, 384 f., II, 226, 251, 253, 267, 272, 365, 411; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64, 69; a reply to the sonnets, II, 87
 Apollo, sonnets to, II, 164
 apostrophe, Sh.'s use of the, II, 7 f., in plural nouns, II, 15
 appendix, sonnets forming an, I, 391, II, 82, 94 ff., 421. See arrangement
 Apperson, G. L., proverbs (*q. v.*), I, 247, 250 f., 348
 applying fears, I, 300
 approve (=prove), I, 183 f.; (=use sexually), I, 119; I desperate approve, I, 379 f.
 April, lovely, of her prime, I, 12 ff., II, 120, 210 n.; proud-pied April, I, 241, II, 211 f., 330; three April perfumes, I, 255 (cf. II, 61 f., 159, 241)
 Arber, Edward, I, 170, 235, II, 1, 19, 23, 53, 63, 290 n., 295, 301, 327
Arcadia (magazine), I, 319
Archaeologia, I, 200
 Archer, C., I, 36, 71, 256
 Archer, William, I, 39 f., 46, 148, 201, 312, 315, 345, II, 54, 66, 172, 189 f., 194, 199 f., 200, 264
Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen, I, 65, 128, 132, 136, 152, 195, 239, 247, 323, 326, 333, 346, 348, 351, 354, 361, 363, 366, 379, 382 f., 387 f., 391, II, 131, 158, 233, 237 n., 245, 250 f., 259 n., 383, 386, 405
Archiv für Litteraturgeschichte, II, 380
 Arco, Niccolò d', Conte, I, 394
Arcturus, II, 370
 are (second person verb), I, 130
 Arensberg, W. C., II, 229
 Argentina, the sonnets in, II, 397
 argument (=subject), I, 109, 196 f., 248 f., 254, 257 f.; my lovely argument, I, 203
 Armas y Cárdenas, José de, II, 397
 Armstrong, John ("Albert"), II, 337
 Armstrong, S. T., II, 34
 Armstrong, T. P., I, 51
 Arnaud, Simone, II, 272, 391
 Arnold, Charles, II, 323
 Arnold, Matthew, II, 428
 Arnold, T. J. I., II, 395
 arrangement, the, of Q, discussed, II, 74-116; other comments on, I, 5 f., 53, 78, 92, 103, 114, 154, 163, 169, 186, 194, 196, 198 f., 206, 227, 229, 239, 248, 252, 254, 294, 320, 323, 330 f., 340, 372 f., 375, 379, 391, II, 20 f., 27, 33, 55, 59 f., 62 f., 67 f., 135, 143, 159, 172, 177, 181, 242, 244 ff., 260, 360, 414, 417, 427, *et passim*. See appendix; envoys; links

- array, rebel powers that thee, I, 374, 376 ff.
- arrest, that fell, I, 192
- art (=literary skill), I, 83 f.; art's false face, I, 323 f.; false art of Sh.'s rivals, I, 177, II, 122; knows no art, I, 315, 317; read such art, I, 39 f.; slay by art, I, 356; tongue-tied art, I, 174, 176
- article, omission of the, I, 97
- artificial sonnet, the most, I, 174
- arts (=learning), I, 201 f.
- Arundel, Earl of: *see* Howard (Philip)
- as (=as that), I, 201; (=as though), I, 166; omission of *as*, I, 13, 303
- As You Like It*, I, 42, 99, 105 f., 207, 211, 223, 241, 275, II, 21, 29, 39, 209 n., 249, 315 f., 324 f., 358 n.; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64
- Ascham, Roger, II, 249
- Asen, Abraham, II, 399
- Ashbaugh, S. S., II, 221
- Asher, David, I, 393, II, 214
- ashes of youth, I, 189, 191
- Ashton, Winifred ("Clemence Dane"), II, 266 n.
- askance and strangely, I, 275, 277 (cf. II, 15)
- aspéct, I, 16
- Aspley, William, II, 1 f., 3 n.; sketch of, II, 5
- assassin's knife, Sh. and the, I, 193
- assistance, fair, I, 201
- assonance, examples of, I, 11, 59, 163, 241, 253, 303. *See* rimes
- Astley, Hugh, II, 172
- Aston, Walter, the friend, II, 226
- astonished, my verse, I, 217 f., II, 226
- Astrana Marín, Luis, II, 396
- astrology, Sh. and, I, 42, 73, 77, 161, 242, 264 f.
- astronomy (=astrology), I, 39; Sh.'s ideas of astronomy, I, 21, II, 130
- asyndeton, I, 145
- Athenae Oxonienses*, II, 301
- Athenaeum*, I, 10, 23, 60, 65, 73, 83, 100, 113, 145, 147, 160, 174, 177, 183, 194, 206, 210, 212, 233, 239, 264, 266, 273, 287, 296, 302, 315 f., 363, II, 6, 22 n., 57, 77, 167 ff., 171, 181, 188, 191, 197, 202, 213, 216, 219 f., 223, 260, 263 n., 268, 302, 304, 326 n., 343, 356, 361
- Atlantic Monthly*, II, 111
- atom, Bruno's doctrine of, II, 129 f.
See Bruno
- attaint, without, I, 208
- attainted (=infected), I, 221
- Aubin, R. A., II, 331
- Aubrey, John, II, 195, 212 n., 269 f., 271 n., 307
- audit (=account), I, 15 f. (cf. II, 8 f. n., 181, 185); called to that audit, I, 134; delayed audit, I, 319, 321
- Augener, George, and Company, II, 316 f., 322
- augurs, sad, I, 263, 269 f.
- Augustine, St., II, 128
- Ausonius, I, 59
- Austro-Hungary, the sonnets in, II, 397. *See* Vienna
- authenticity, the, of the sonnets, discussed, II, 42-52; other comments on, I, 54 f., 61, 189, 225, 246, 327, 331, 344, 372 f., 387, 391, II, 82, 100-103, 253, 283, 335, 337, 366, 387, 415, *et passim*. *See* Bacon (Anthony, Francis); Barnard (—); Barnes; Devereux (Robert); Dyer (Edward); Manners (Roger); Raleigh (Walter); Sidney (Philip); Stanley (William); Vere (Edward de); etc.
- authorizing, I, 16, 100 f.
- autobiography in the sonnets, discussed, II, 133-165; other comments on, II, 74 ff., 81, 83, 85, 87, 118, 126 ff., 248, 250 ff., 350, 354 f., 359, 372, 380 f., 388, 393, 414, 436, *et passim*. *See* "confessions"; conventions; sincerity
- autumn, teeming, I, 239 f. (cf. II, 8 f. n.)
- Avisa, the dark woman, II, 269 f., 303 f. *See* *Willobie*
- "avouched," poems, by Sh., II, 23 f., 26
- Axon, W. E. A., II, 263 n.
- Axson, Stockton, II, 151 f.
- aye me, I, 116 f.
- Ayscough, Samuel, II, 40, 337
- Azarias, Brother: *see* Mullany
- B., C. C., I, 249, 318, 321, 377, II, 282
- B., D., II, 297, 307 n.
- B., J. G., I, 66, 157
- B., S. J. C., II, 395

- Baake, Josef, II, 366 n.
 Bab, Julius, I, 175, II, 52 n., 54, 76, 207 f., 385, 414 f.
 babe, love is a, I, 291 f.
 Babits, Michael, II, 397
 baby worship, the sonnets as, II, 161
 back, lame, Sh.'s, I, 106; my patient back, I, 106, 220
 Bacon, Alice Barnham, Lady, sonnets to, II, 164, 274
 Bacon, Anthony, author of the sonnets, I, 107, II, 44 f., 228
 Bacon, Francis, Viscount St. Albans, I, 96, 331, II, 249, 278; *alias* Sh., I, 106, II, 42, 43 n., 44, 50 n., 107, 163 ff., 195, 207, 214 ff., 223 f., 228 f., 237 n., 265 n., 274 ff., 284; author of the dedication, II, 174, and of *Willobie*, II, 313 n.; lameness of, I, 223 f.; publishes Q, II, 182, 218; referred to in Q, II, 9 n.
Baconiana, II, 44, 55 n., 163, 223, 228 f., 272-275, 278, 280, 313 n.
 bad sonnets in Q, I, 203, 246, 254, 268, 372 f., II, 47-52, 365 f., *et passim*
 badges of either's woe, I, 123 f.
 Baehrens, Emil, I, 330, 393 f.
 Bagehot, Walter, II, 361
 Baiae, Italy, warm bath of, I, 393 f.
 bail, without all, I, 192
 Bailey, John, II, 155, 180, 418 f.
 Bailey, Margery, II, 65
 Bald, R. C., II, 222 n., 223
 Baldensperger, Fernand, II, 9 n., 111, 174, 392. (His translation, *Les Sonnets de Sh.*, was published by the University of California Press, 1943, too late to be referred to)
 Baldwin, C. C. ("George Gordon"), II, 266, 270
 Baldwin, T. W., II, 227, 268 n., 313
 Baldwin, William, II, 130
 Balls, J., II, 324 f.
 Baltimore *Daily Record*, I, 76
 Baltzer, A., II, 259 n., 385
 Bampfylde, J. C., II, 344
 Bang, Willy, II, 308
 bankrupt, nature, is, I, 177 f.
 banks, come daily to the, I, 152 f.
 banned, the sonnets, in New Zealand, II, 338 n. *See* suppressed
 Bapst, Edmond, II, 209 n.
 bare truth, I, 181
 bareness, old December's, I, 239
 bark, every wandering, I, 293; my saucy (*q. v.*) bark, I, 204 f.
 Barker, George, II, 318
 barley-break, Sh. on, I, 371
 Barnard, —, of Abington, *alias* Sh., II, 45
 Barnard, E. A. B., II, 29 n.
 Barnard, Finch, II, 45, 175, 243
 Barnes, Barnabe, I, 53, 69, 127 f., 196, 201, 205, 244, 261, 296, 300, 318, 334, 340, 342, II, 62, 117, 253, 287, 306 n., 431; part-author of Q, II, 46 ff., 102; the rival poet, II, 124, 277, 283, 286 f., 289 ff., 293
 Barnfield, Richard, I, 63, 102, 214, 242, II, 117, 123, 127, 327, 365; the rival poet, II, 277
 Barnstorff, D., I, 376, II, 140, 157, 159-162, 214 ff., 224, 272
 Baron, Robert, I, 14, 45, 64, 67, 179, II, 227 n.
 Barrell, C. W., II, 230, 276
 barren rime, my, I, 44
 Barrett, H. W., II, 77, 256, 371 f.
 Barrie, James, Sir, II, 377
 Barrington, Russell, Mrs., II, 361
 Barry, Lording, I, 327
 bars, under truest, I, 132
 Bartels, Adolf, II, 264 n., 380, 387
 Bartholomew, A. T., II, 2
 Bartlett, Henrietta C., II, 1, 2 f. n.
 Barton, A. T., II, 399
 Barton, D. P., Sir, I, 127
 Barton, T. P., II, 371
 base clouds, I, 98; base subjects, I, 248
 bases, great, for eternity, I, 315 f.
 basest (=darkest), I, 95 f.
 Baskervill, C. R., I, 330
 Basse, William, II, 20 f.
 Batchelor, H. C., II, 164
 Bates, E. S., II, 126, 128, 151, 190
 Bath, sonnets referring to, I, 395, II, 83, 110, 377
 Bathurst, Charles, II, 78, 361, 402 f.
 battering days, siege of, I, 172 f.
 Baudelaire, C. P., I, 20, 84, II, 422
 bay where all men ride, I, 351, II, 366
 Bayfield, M. A., I, 17, 24, 327
 Baym, M. I., I, 20, 84, II, 126 n.
 Bayne, Thomas, I, 174
 be (optative), I, 187

- bear (=harbor), I, 8
 beard, bristly, corn's, I, 32 f.
 bears it out, I, 293, 295
 beated and chopped, I, 165 f., II, 48, 426, 428
 Beatty, Arthur, II, 66
 Beaumont, Francis, II, 20, 23
 beauteous and lovely, I, 144 f.
 beauty, Platonic idea of, I, 90, II, 131, 409 (*see* Plato); poor beauty, I, 177 f.; spirit of beauty, the friend as the, II, 215; suspected beauty, I, 183 f.; truth and beauty, I, 39 f., 250, II, 162 f.
 beauty's legacy, thy, I, 15; beauty's waste, I, 26 f.
 Beckwith, Elizabeth, I, 87 f., 91, 156, II, 67 f.
 becoming, this, I, 385
 Beddoes, T. L., I, 275, 333, II, 222 n., 354
 "Bede, Cuthbert": *see* Bradley (Edward)
 bedeguar, I, 145
 beds' revenues, I, 363 f.
 bed-vow, thy, broke, I, 389 f., II, 157, 366
 Beeching, H. C., I, 9, 11, 13 f., 18, 22, 24, 28 f., 38 f., 42 f., 45 f., 48 f., 53, 58, 61 f., 64, 66 f., *et passim*, II, 6, 8 f., 11-15, 66 f., 95 f., 122 f., 146, 171 f., 179, 181, 183 ff., 190 f., 202 ff., 231, 277 ff., 284, 293, 305, 343 n., 365
 Beerbohm, Max, II, 266 n.
 Beer-Walbrunn, Anton, II, 314, 316, 318, 320, 324
 befits (plural verb), I, 116 f.
 begetter, only, I, 3, II, 179, *et passim*; discussed, II, 166-176; equals purloiner, II, 82
 Begley, W. E., II, 164, 195, 207 n., 265 n.
Beiblatt zur Anglia (q. v.), I, 84, 111, 175, 266, 305, II, 50, 105, 141, 148, 153, 203 n., 208 n., 219 f., 237, 387
 Bekk, Adolf, I, 176, 313 f., II, 188, 233, 257, 259, 280, 385
 Bekker, W. G., II, 182
 Belcher, J. H., II, 34
Belgravian, I, 253
 bell, surly, sullen, I, 186, II, 44
 Bell, John, II, 31, 336
 Bell, Robert, I, 70, 102, 279 f., 285, 301, 327, II, 77 f., 90, 139, 179, 185 n., 260, 361
 Bellezza, Paolo, I, 51
 Belloc, Hilaire, II, 343 n.
Belvedere, Bodenham's, II, 172
 Bembo, Pietro, II, 62, 234, 241, 254
 Ben., Dan., II, 297 n.
 Benda, J. W. O., II, 378
 Benecke, G. F., II, 381 f.
 Benedetti, Anna, II, 105, 394
 Bénézet, L. P., II, 230
 Bennett, Arnold, II, 265
 Benson, John, biographical sketch of, II, 19 f.
 Benson, John, Sh.'s *Poems* (1640), "copy" used by, II, 25-28; described, II, 18-28; detects no autobiography, II, 133, 151, 256; editions based on, II, 29-36, 332-336, Lintott on, II, 38; gives titles to the sonnets, II, 20 f. (*see* titles); manuscript annotations in, I, 5 f., 55, 176, II, 22; manuscript copies of sonnets in, I, 8, 10, 160, 173, 261, 263, 354, II, 328; mentioned, II, 326, 329 ff., 378, 379 n.; Moseley's lost edition of, II, 29 n., 327 n.; omits the dedication, II, 22, 25, 29, 166, 236, and eight sonnets, I, 50, 52, 121, 152, 194, 196, 237, 319, II, 20, 26; personal pronouns changed in, II, 20, 133, 236, 243 f., 329; readings of, I, 338, 354, 376; rearranges the sonnets, I, 169, 192, II, 20 ff., 74 f., 86
 Bentinck Library, Varel, Germany, II, 2
 Berkeley, Henry, Sir, II, 194 f., 206
 Berzeviczy, Albert de, II, 151, 235
 besides (preposition), I, 65 f.
 besiege thy brow, winters, I, 10 f., II, 329
 best, my days past the, I, 353, 355 (cf. II, 226); thou best of dearest, I, 132
 Best, Charles, the friend, II, 226 f.
 better (=surpass), I, 227; better part of me, I, 111, II, 246
 bettered (=made happier), I, 194 f.
 bettering of the time, I, 92 f.
 Betterton, Thomas, II, 269 f., 271 n.
 bevel (=slanting), I, 304, 306
 bewailed guilt, Sh.'s, I, 103 f. *See* immorality

- Beyersdorff, Robert, II, 129 f.
 Beza, Marcu, II, 397
 Beza, Theodore, I, 113
 Biagi, Guido, II, 394 n.
 Bible, Holy, cited, I, 18, 154 f., 216;
 Sh.'s use of the, I, 16, 21, 159, 176,
 232, 258, 277, 284, 306, 312, 384, II,
 125, 130, 157, 171, 272; version
 used, I, 375, II, 125 n. *See* Carter;
 Lord's
Bibliographer, II, 268 n.
Bibliographische Adversaria, II, 395
 "Bibliothecary," I, 293
 bide each check, I, 156 f.
 bier, borne on the, I, 32 f.
 Bigazzini, Francesco, II, 132
 Bioren and Madan, II, 39 f.
 Birch, W. J., II, 228, 360 f.
 Bird, Ann, II, 306
 Bird, Anne: *see* Davenant (Anne)
 Bird, William, II, 270, 308
 Birdwood, George, I, 145
 Birrell, Francis, II, 238
Birth of Merlin, I, 40
 Bishop, H. R., Sir, II, 314-322, 324 f.
 bitter (=better), I, 227 (cf. II, 18 n.);
 bitter sauces, I, 298 f., II, 426
 black, not counted fair, I, 323 f., 336,
 II, 254 f., 267, 275. *See* blonde
 Black, John, II, 133
 blackmail, the dedication, II, 174
 blacks, waste, I, 198, 200
Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, I,
 160, 311, 376 f., II, 80, 128, 134,
 136, 159, 181, 183, 234, 249 n., 265
 n., 282, 288 f., 342, 345, 347, 350,
 352, 354, 363
 Blades, William, I, 69
Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung,
 I, 393
 Blanár, Imre, II, 397
 Blanchemain, Prosper, I, 394
 blanks, waste, I, 198, 200
 Blatt, W. M., II, 160, 222
 blazon of beauty's best, I, 260 f.
 Bleibtreu, Karl, II, 45, 165, 207, 274
 blenches, these, I, 275, 277, 281
 blessed wood, I, 326 f.
 blessing every book, I, 208 f.
 blind, sonnets recorded for the, II,
 376 n.; blind soul, I, 349 f.
 blindness, gave eyes to, I, 389 f.
 Bliss, Philip, II, 18 n., 301
 blonde beauty, preferred to brunette,
 I, 323 f., II, 127, 132, 254 f. *See*
 black
 blood, all kinds of, I, 273 f.; beggared
 of, I, 177 f.; burn in her, I, 52 f.;
 sportive, I, 304 f.; that fresh, I,
 30 f.
 blots that remain, I, 103 f.
 Blount, Charles, eighth Baron
 Mountjoy, Earl of Devonshire, II,
 260 f.; *alias* Sh., II, 45
 Blount, Edward, II, 5
 blunt invention, my, I, 254
 blunting, for, I, 140
 Boaden, James, I, 6, 117, II, 54, 117,
 142, 167, 177, 186 f., 195 ff., 200,
 203, 279, 358
 Boas, F. S., II, 59, 144, 189, 199, 268
 n., 285
 boastfulness, Sh.'s, I, 44, 147, 206,
 II, 175. *See* immortality; self-praise
 Boccaccio, Giovanni, I, 371
 Bodenham, John, II, 172
 Bodenstein, Friedrich, I, 273, II, 70,
 141, 187, 214 f., 279, 383 f., 403;
 music for his versions, II, 316 f.,
 320, 324; rearranges the sonnets, I,
 154, 192, 229, II, 78, 80, 87 f., 395
 body and soul, conflict of, I, 376
 Böcking, Eduard, II, 133, 380
 Bödtker, A. T., II, 254 f.
 Bohemia, Sh. visits, I, 123; the son-
 nets in, II, 398
 Boidefre, Emilia Lemouton de, II, 397
 Boileau-Despréaux, Nicolas, II, 389
 Boleyn, Anne, queen of Henry VIII,
 II, 209
Bollettino d'arte, II, 394 n.
 Bond, William, II, 333
 Bonnevie, Sophie, II, 396
 book, blessing every, I, 208 f.; book
 down, I, 296 f.
Book Monthly, II, 192 n.
Book of Homage to Sh., I, 8, 12, II, 185
Bookmart, II, 182 n.
 books, presagers of my breast, I,
 65 ff.
 Boosey, William, II, 316
 Borghesi, Peter (Pietro), I, 65, II,
 127 n., 144 n., 224, 245, 247, 394
 Bostelmann, L. F., II, 229 n., 274 n.
 Bostock, John, I, 53
 Boston, Sh.'s poems, editions of, in,
 II, 22 n., 33 n., 368, described, II,
 34 ff.

- Boston Gazette*, II, 34
Boston Miscellany, II, 372 n.
 Boswell, James, the elder, II, 349
 Boswell, James, the younger, I, 6, 66, 82, 96, 112, 117, 132, 180, 186, 219 f., 271, 277, 279, II, 38 n., 134, 145, 167, 181, 186, 230, 248, 338 n., 353
 Bosworth, William, I, 10
 Bouchor, Maurice, II, 174
 Boulenger, Jacques, II, 45, 165
 bounty, in, cherish, I, 30 f.
 Bowden, H. S., II, 158
 bower, no holy, I, 323 f.
 Bowles, W. L., II, 341, 344-347, 389
 boy, love of a, conventional, II, 123, 132; sweet boy, I, 271, II, 110, 163, 200, 206 f., 210. *See* lovely
 boy actors, Sh. on, I, 225. *See* acting
 Boyd, M. C., I, 327
 Bradbrook, M. C., II, 310 n., 311
 Bradby, G. F., II, 417 f.
 Bradley, A. C., I, 276, II, 146, 158
 Bradley, Edward ("Cuthbert Bede"), I, 253
 Bradley, Henry, I, 79
 Bradshaw, John, I, 191
 Brae, A. E., I, 293, 323, 374, 376, II, 169, 216
 Braham, John, Sir, II, 315, 324
 Brandes, Georg(e), I, 266, 278, 333, II, 70, 81, 117, 124, 130 f., 203, 264
 Brandl, Alois, I, 7, 56, 78, 266, 269, 314 f., 319 f., 369, 372, II, 61, 82, 121, 124, 147, 174, 191, 194, 221, 237 f. n., 253, 259 n., 285, 305 n.
 brass eternal, I, 169 f.
 brave (=beautiful), I, 32 f.
 bravery, hiding their, I, 98
 Bray, Denys, Sir, I, 134, 138, 189, 288, 383, II, 3, 11, 25, 27, 50, 173, 431; rearranges Q, I, 154, 229, II, 104 f., 107, 109 ff., 161, 395
 Breakspear, Nicholas, Pope Adrian IV, "Sh." derived from, II, 45
 breath, bad, the dark woman's, II, 242 f., Pembroke's, II, 202, 204; breath of words, I, 214, 216
 breathers of this world, I, 206 f.
 breed (=children), I, 32, 34, 53
 Breton, Nicholas, I, 204, 257, II, 3 n., 227
 Brett-James, N. G., II, 227
 breviary, Catholic, I, 200
 Brewer, Wilmon, II, 338, 354
 bridal song, Q a, II, 163
 Bridgeman, C. G. O., II, 264
 Bridges, H. J., II, 70, 100, 153, 305 n.
 Bridges, Robert, II, 234
 Bridgewater, Earl of: *see* Egerton
 bright in dark directed, I, 121
 Bright, B. H., II, 2, 5, 135, 195, 197, 203
 Bright, J. W., I, 9
 Brink, Bernhard ten, II, 386
 British Academy, *Proceedings*, I, 214, II, 254
British Critic, I, 55, II, 249 n., 352
 Britton, John, II, 195, 212 n.
 Brome, Alexander, I, 11
 brood, earth's sweet, I, 52 f.
 Brooke, Arthur, I, 50
 Brooke, Iris, I, 180
 Brooke, Tucker, I, 9 f., 12 f., 16 f., 31, 36 ff., 41 f., 47, 49, 53, 55, 59, 62, 66 f., *et passim*, II, 5, 11-15, 18, 27, 68 f., 109 f., 193 f., 212, 219, 243, 246, 288, 300 n., 301 n., 312, 329, 375, 429 f.
 Brooks, Alden, II, 46, 219, 271, 311
 Brophy, John, I, 370, II, 239 n., 267 n., 313 n.
 Broughton, James, II, 34, 355
 Broughton, Richard, II, 182
 Brower, Reuben, I, 376
 Brown, Carleton, I, 146
 Brown, Catherine H., II, 377
 Brown, Charles Armitage, I, 223, II, 142, 144 f., 196 f., 358; his rearrangement of Q, II, 76 ff., 85 f., attacked, II, 137 f.
 Brown, Henry, I, 22, 45, 64, 66, 144, II, 25, 78, 141, 202, 204, 215, 260 f., 284, 317, 329, 362
 Brown, Ivor, I, 207, II, 227 n.
 Brown, Joseph, II, 228
 Brown, W. B., I, 7, 247, 318 f., II, 8, 184
 Browne, Anthony, first Viscount Montagu, II, 219
 Browne, C. E., II, 181, 203 n.
 Browne, Thomas, Sir, I, 8, 79, 264, II, 235
 Browne, William, I, 94, 96
 Browning, Elizabeth Barrett, I, 84 f., II, 360, 375
 Browning, Robert, I, 84 f., 160, II, 105, 142, 155

- Brownlow, E. B., I, 319
 Bruce, Robert de, II, 316 ff., 322
 Brun, Charles le, I, 51
 Brun, Emile le, II, 391
 Brunck, R. F. P., I, 392 f.
 Brunet, Charles, I, 124
 brunettes, not regarded as beautiful, I, 323 f. *See* blonde
 Brunius, August, II, 396
 Bruno, Giordano, II, 409; Sh. and, I, 158, 268, 320, 372, II, 129 ff.
Brunonian, II, 374
 Bryant, W. C., II, 370
 Brydges, S. E., Sir, II, 299 n., 301, 341, 349, 356 f.
 Bucke, R. M., II, 164
 Buckhurst, Lord: *see* Sackville
 Bucknill, J. C., Sir, on Sh. and medicine, I, 281 f., 298, 300 f., 379, 391
 Budd, T. D., II, 157, 247, 374
 buds, masked, I, 144 f., II, 330
 Büchner, Alexander, II, 383
 building, of tall, I, 204 f.
 Bullen, A. H., I, 11, 93 f., 214, 387, II, 9, 287, 291
 Bulloch, John, I, 137, 139, 160, 167, 177, 241, 315, 319, 374
 Bullough, Geoffrey, I, 57, 395, II, 110
 Burbage, Richard, I, 70, 280; sonnets to, II, 178, 225
 burden, wanton, I, 239 f.
 Burgersdijk, L. A. J., I, 304, II, 88, 142, 170 n., 231, 395
 Burghley, Lord: *see* Cecil (William)
 Burgon, —, conjecture by, I, 214
 Burgon, J. W., II, 197
 burial service, reference to the, I, 193
 burn in her blood, I, 52 f.
 Burr, W. H., II, 223, 274
 burthen, second, of a former child, I, 158 f.
 Burton, Robert, II, 329
 Busby, Stanhope, II, 358
 Bush, Douglas, I, 270, II, 288
 Bushnell, G. H., II, 31 n.
 busy care, I, 366 f.
 but (=only), I, 74; (=that not), I, 173; sonnets beginning with *but*, I, 44, 192, 229
 but . . . nor, I, 361
 Butler, B. F., II, 370
 Butler, J. D., I, 154
 Butler, Pierce, II, 271 n.
 Butler, Samuel, I, 23, 71, 93, 98, 106 f., 109 f., 272, 326, 345, 348, 372, II, 2, 6, 25, 56, 145 n., 171, 173 f. n., 234, 238, 245, 293, 364; on the dates, I, 263, II, 57 f., 212, 282, 286 n.; on Hughes, the cook, II, 182 f., 221; rearranges Q, II, 94, 106
 Byars, W. V., II, 376
 Bynner, Witter, II, 376 n.
 Byrne, St. Geraldine, Sister, I, 37
 Byron, George Gordon, sixth Baron, I, 63, II, 256, 341
 Byvanck, W. G. C., I, 8, 12, II, 185
 C., E., *Emaricdulfe*, I, 330
 C., E., *G. M.*, II, 342
 C., E. M., II, 222 n.
 C., R. G., II, 213 n., 214 n., 257
 Cabot, J. E., II, 371 n.
 Caclamanos, Demetrius, II, 399
 Cadiz, Spain, Elizabethan victory at, I, 265, II, 57, 187 n., 219; Raleigh wounded at, I, 107. *See* Spain
 Cadoux, A. T., II, 155 f.
 Caesar, Gaius Julius, deaf, I, 223. *See* *Julius Caesar*
Cahiers de la quinzaine, II, 391
 Caine, T. Hall, Sir, I, 184, 225, 239, II, 79, 364, 406 f.
 Cairos-Rego, Rex de, II, 317
Calcutta Review, II, 215, 254
 Caldecott, Thomas, I, 393, II, 1 f., 5
 Caldwell, G. S., II, 44, 273
 Caledon, Lord: *see* Alexander (E. J. D.)
 Calenberg, Philippine von, II, 381
Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, II, 183, 210
 California University *Chronicle*, I, 169
 Calina, Josephine (Mrs. Allardyce Nicoll), II, 378, 398
Caltha Poetarum, Cutwoode's, II, 301
 Calvert, G. H., II, 43, 77
 Cambridge Editors, I, 377, II, 5, 38, 334. *See* Clark (W. G.)
Cambridge History of English Literature, I, 174, II, 151, 187, 247, 365
 Camden, Carroll, Jr., I, 73
 Camden Society *Miscellany*, II, 182
 Camden, William, I, 264 f., 267, II, 182
 Camerarius, Herbertus, I, 159
 Camoens, Luis de, II, 342, 392

- Campanella, Tommaso, II, 130
 Campbell, John, first Baron Campbell, I, 76, 127
 Campbell, Thomas, II, 135, 145, 196, 354 f.
 Campe, Frederick, and Company, II, 369
 Campion, Thomas, I, 245, II, 290, 326, 336
 candles, gold (=stars), I, 60 ff.
 canker in the fragrant rose, I, 236;
 loathsome canker, I, 100 f.; vengeful canker, I, 244, 247; canker blooms, I, 144 f.; canker vice, I, 183, 185
 canopy, I bore the, I, 315 f.; canopy the herd, I, 32 f.
 Cape, Jonathan, II, 1
 Capell, Edward, I, 33, 58, 66, 75, 82, 96, 101, 105 f., 126, 133, 157, 170, 175, 184, 192, 195, 197, 235, 252, 321, II, 2, 26 n., 32, 38, 39 n., 40, 186, 331, 334 f.
 capitalization, Sh.'s, I, 205, 227, 397, II, 4, 7 f., 16, 181, 229 n.
 captain ill, I, 174, 176, II, 426; captain jewels, I, 140 f.
 captive good, I, 174, 176, II, 426
 Caracciolo, Luigi, II, 320
 carcanet, I, 140 f.
 Carducci, Giosuè, II, 392 f.
 careful housewife, I, 366 f.
 Carew, Thomas, II, 20, 22 n.
 Carey, Elizabeth, II, 206, 210
 Carey, George, Sir, II, 57, 206, 210
 Carey, Henry, I, 327
 Carey, Thomas, II, 20
 Carlyle, Alexander, II, 359
 Carlyle, Thomas, II, 137, 358 f., 361
 Caro, Miguel Antonio, II, 396 n.
 Carpenter, B. F., I, 322, II, 24, 180, 218
 Carr, Frank, I, 24
 Carriere, Moriz, II, 250, 258
 Carter, Thomas, on Sh. and the Bible (*q. v.*), I, 185, 193, 375
 Cartwright, Robert, I, 193, 286, 374, II, 70, 121, 167 f., 187, 272, 281; rearranges Q, II, 87
 Cartwright, William, II, 20
 Casady, Edwin, II, 209 n.
 case, in love's fresh, I, 271 f.
 Case, R. H., I, 16, 27, 77, 91, 101 f., 114, 128, 166, 170, 178, 182, 185, 194, 199, 227, 230, 245, 269, 277, 297, 301, 305, 316 f., 340, 348, 359, 364, 377, 380
 Cassirer, Ernst, II, 158
 cast his utmost sum, I, 134
 Castiglione, Baldassare, II, 131
 Catalan, the sonnets in, II, 396 f.
 Catholic, Roman, intrigues, I, 313 f.
See celibacy; Jesuits
Catholic World, I, 322, II, 24, 180, 205, 218, 276
 Catullus, I, 78, 87, 385 f., II, 131, 247
 Causton, H. K. S., I, 281
 Cavalieri, Tommaso de', I, 278, II, 235
 Cavendish, Christian Bruce, supposed Countess of Devonshire, Pembroke's sonnets to, II, 92, 261 f.
 Cavendish, William, first Earl of Devonshire, the friend, II, 228
 Cavendish, William, second Earl of Devonshire, II, 92, 261
 Cecil, Robert, first Earl of Salisbury, I, 93
 Cecil, William, Baron Burghley, I, 265, II, 56, 193, 212
 celibacy, Romish, attacked, II, 244.
See Catholic
 censorship of the stage, Sh. on, I, 176
 censures falsely, I, 381
 center of my sinful earth, I, 374, 376, II, 421
 central sonnet, Sh.'s, II, 94
 Chalmers, Alexander, II, 349, 357
 Chalmers, George, I, 55, II, 2, 53, 117 f., 133, 166, 179, 222, 243, 248 f., 279, 332, 344, 400
 Chamberlain, John, II, 212
 Chamberlaine, William, I, 150
 Chambers, E. K., Sir, I, 176, 235, 261, 264 f., 269, 374, II, 10, 50 f., 61, 64, 84, 105, 179, 194, 199, 206, 209, 217 n., 221, 225, 264, 304, 308 n., 311, 367
 Chambers, Robert, II, 137, 360
Chambers's Edinburgh Journal, II, 44
 Chambrun, Clara Longworth, Comtesse de, II, 221, 270 f.; rearranges Q, II, 98 f.
 change, in this, my invention spent, I, 257, 259
 changing course, nature's, I, 50 f.
 Channing, W. E., II, 370 f.
 Chapman, George, I, 7, 27, 61, 199,

- 201, 229, 316, 331, 334, 350, II, 183;
 philosophy of, II, 228; publishes Q,
 II, 101; the rival poet, I, 217, II,
 9 n., 58, 229, 277, 282, 284-288,
 290 f., 293, 305, 307, 309 f.
 Chapman, J. A., II, 437
 Chapman, J. J., I, 6, 142, 298, II, 241,
 412
 Chappell, William, II, 319, 322
 character, in, mind was done, I,
 158 f.; ink may character, I, 271;
 reserve their character, I, 214 f.
 characterized, full, I, 307
 charge, eat up thy, I, 374, 378
 Charles I, king of England, I, 266
 Charlton, H. B., I, 207, 327
 charter of thy worth, I, 219; your
 charter, so strong, I, 156 f.
 Chasles, Philarète, II, 167 ff., 175,
 207, 213
 Chateaubriand, F. A. R., vicomte de,
 I, 106, II, 247, 389 f.
 Chaucer, Geoffrey, I, 324, 334, 377;
 the rival poet, II, 292; Sh. borrows
 from, I, 191, 299 f., II, 125, 275,
 292, and edits, II, 125
 cheap, sold, what is dear, I, 275, 277
 cheater, gentle, I, 387 f.
 check (=rebuke), I, 349; bide each
 check, I, 156 f.
 cheer, so dull a, I, 239 f.
 cheered and checked, I, 41 f.
 "Cherstow, Harriet B., Mrs.," I, 100
 cherubins, I, 289, II, 8 n.
 chest (=coffer, breast), I, 132, 140 f.
 Chester, Robert, II, 313 n.
 Chew, S. C., II, 110
 Chiarini, Giuseppe, II, 144 n., 198,
 235 n., 259 n., 263 n., 393
 chiasmus, examples of, I, 80, 195
 chide with fortune, I, 279, 281
 chief, of my wailing, I, 119
 child, former, second burthen of a, I,
 158 f.; child of state, I, 311 f.
 Child, F. J., II, 374 f.
 children, one's immortality in, I, 6 f.
See procreation
 chips, dancing, I, 326 f.
 Choice Drollery, I, 338
 choirs, bare ruined, I, 189 f., II, 420
 chopped, beated and, I, 165 f., II, 48,
 426, 428
 Christ, Sh.'s "love," I, 369
 Christian Examiner, II, 197, 247, 283,
 373
 chronicle of wasted time, I, 260 f.
 Church, E. D., II, 2
 Church, John, II, 316 f., 319 f.
 churches, ruined, Sh. on, I, 190
 Churchyard, Thomas, II, 217, 290
 churls, I, 181 f.
 Chute, Anthony, the rival poet, II,
 289
 Cicero, I, 207
 'cide, to, this title, I, 127 ff.
 ciphers in Q, II, 229. *See* acrostics
 Circovitch, Inez, the dark woman, II,
 267 n.
 Clarence, Luce, II, 391
 Clarendon, Earl of: *see* Hyde (Ed-
 ward)
 Clark, Andrew, II, 269, 271 n.
 Clark, Cumberland, I, 96, II, 149,
 192, 206
 Clark, D. L., I, 279
 Clark, W. G., and W. A. Wright,
 Cambridge Editors (*q. v.*), I, 182,
 II, 40 f.
 Clarke, Helen A., II, 318 f.
 Clarke, J. F., II, 140
 Clarkson, P. S., I, 16, 37, 76, 127, 229,
 303, 343, 352, 388, II, 184
 Classical Weekly, I, 381
 clean starved, I, 194 f.
 clear (=beautiful), I, 212 f.
 Clemen, Wolfgang, I, 95, 189
 Cleopatra, the dark woman, II, 226,
 272
 clerk, unlettered, like, I, 214, 216
 Clerkenwell, Abbess of, II, 272
 climacteric, grand, Elizabeth's, I,
 264 f., 267, 269. *See* Elizabeth
 cloak, Sh. travels without his, I, 98
 clock, count the, I, 32 f.; watch the,
 I, 154 f.
 closure, gentle, I, 132
 cloud, region, I, 95, 97. *See* region
 clouds and eclipses, I, 100, II, 62
 Clutton-Brock, Arthur, II, 151
 Cochin, Henry, II, 143
 Cochrane, R., II, 44
 Cocks, Robert, and Company, II,
 316 f., 322
 Coleridge, E. H., II, 346
 Coleridge, Hartley, II, 136, 232,
 347 f., 354, 370
 Coleridge, H. N., II, 136, 349

- Coleridge, S. T., I, 55, 96, 206, II, 136, 232 f., 244, 265, 345-349, 406
 colleges, American, Sh. study in, II, 368 f., 374 ff.
 Collier, J. P., I, 31, 82, 176 f., 218, 286 f., 321, 338, 378, 391, II, 1, 3, 6, 70, 77, 135 ff., 140, 167 f., 230 f., 248, 280, 302, 360
Collier's Weekly, I, 276
 Collin, Christen, II, 396
 Collins and Hannay, II, 36
 Collins, Arthur, II, 204, 206, 211
 Collins, J. C., I, 127, 392 n., 393, II, 156, 305
 Collison-Morley, Lacy, II, 377
 colon, sonnets ending with a, II, 78; wonderful, I, 381, II, 272. *See* punctuation
 color, fixt with his, I, 250; color groups, Sh.'s, I, 32 f., 96
 colored ill, a woman, I, 368, 370, II, 55
 Colse, Peter, II, 299 f., 307
 Columbia University, Sh. study in, II, 369
Columbian Centinel, II, 34
 Colvin, Ian, II, 111
Comedy of Errors, I, 28, 130, 301; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64
 comma, emphasizing, I, 212, II, 7, 17. *See* punctuation
 Commandments, the Ten, sonnet founded on, I, 258, 278. *See* Bible
 commend, as foes, I, 181 (cf. II, 7)
 commendatory poem in Q, I, 149
 comment (=discourse), I, 223
 common, grow, I, 181 f.; wide world's common place, I, 351 f.
 compare, false, I, 333 (cf. 339); proud compare, I, 60 f.
 comparisons, Sh.'s use of, I, 15; other poets', attacked, I, 61. *See* imagery; metaphors
 compeers by night, his, I, 217, II, 277, 280 f., 284, 288, 291
 compile (=compose), I, 201 f.
 compiled, comments richly, I, 214, II, 280 n.
 complain, to (=by causing me to complain), I, 81
Complete Peerage, II, 219, 227 n., 261, 274
 composed wonder, I, 158 f.
 compounded with clay, I, 186
 compounds, eager, I, 298 f.; com- pounds strange, I, 196 f., II, 127
 Concanen, Matthew, II, 334
 concealed, faults, I, 221
 conceit (=idea), I, 41 f.; conceit of love, I, 271 f., II, 159
 conceits, attacked, I, 60 ff., 333 f.; Sh.'s, I, 69 f., 90, 95, 165, 178, 190, 204, 245 ff., 261, 273, 394, II, 119, 127, 145, 336 f., 353, 356, 358 f., 361, 366, 371, 373, 398, 400, 408, 435. *See* conventions; imagery; plays on words
 Condell, Henry, II, 195 f., 201, 211
 "confessions," Sh.'s, II, 85, 136, 233, 244, 357, 369. *See* autobiography
 confined doom, I, 263, 269, II, 274
 confound (=destroy), I, 17 f., 160 f., 181 f.
 confounded to decay, state, I, 169, 171
 confounding age's knife, I, 167 f., 193
 confounds (=wastes), I, 23 f., 53; confounds mine ear, I, 326 f.
 Congreve, William, II, 37
 conquest, coward, I, 192 f.; conquest of thy sight, I, 127 f.
 Conrad, Hermann (formerly H. Isaac), I, 6, 56, 63, 65 f., 78, 128, 132 f., 136, 152, 167, 194 f., 239, 245, 247, 265, 287, 323, 326, 333, 346, 348, 351, 354, 361, 363, 366, 379, 382 f., 387 f., 391, II, 56, 63 ff., 67, 92, 118 f., 124, 131, 142, 144, 158, 191, 199, 223, 233 ff., 245, 250 f., 282 f., 291, 386, 405
 conscience, born of love, I, 387 f. (cf. II, 142 f.)
 consecrate (=consecrated), I, 192 f., 219
 Constable, Henry, I, 69, 72, 120, 128, 210, 243, 245, 261, 327 f., 357, II, 62, 63 n., 117, 124, 365, 430
Contemporary Review, I, 395, II, 160, 273, 279, 304, 405
 content (=what you contain), I, 9
 contents, shine in these, I, 147, 150
 contracted new, two, I, 152 f.; contracted to thine eyes, I, 5, 8
 contrasts, coincidence of, II, 129
 conventions and commonplaces in Q, II, 125-128, 240 f., 253 ff., 292, 310, 411, *et passim*. *See also* autobiography; conceits; dramatic; friendship; humility; immortality;

- literary exercises; love; men; old age
 convert (pronunciation), I, 39 f.
 converted (=changed), I, 134 f.
 convertest (intransitive), I, 30 f.
 Conway, Eustace, II, 178, 207 n., 254, 290
 Cook, A. S., I, 377 f.
 Cooke, C., II, 344, 348
 Cooke, G. W., II, 370
 Cooke, T. S., II, 319, 322
 Cooper, J. F., II, 369
 Copernican system, Sh. and the, I, 21
 Copetta, Francesco, II, 127, 132, 240
 Copin, Alfred, II, 92 f., 390
 copy (=transcript impression), I, 30 f.
 Corbet, Richard, Bishop, II, 225
 Corbett, H. M., II, 317
Coriolanus, I, 19, 66, 93, 99, 105, 129, 150, 182, 275, 287, 289, 294, 384, II, 266; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64
 Cornell University, Sh. study in, II, 369
 Corney, Bolton, II, 55, 137, 140, 168, 207
Cornhill Magazine, I, 93, 247, II, 145, 190, 200, 203
 Cornish, F. W., II, 209 n.
Corona, II, 385 n.
 correspondence, no, with true sight, I, 381
 Corser, Thomas, II, 299 n.
 Cory, William, II, 209 n.
 cosmetics, Sh. attacks, I, 177-180, 324 f.
 cosmic sense, Q addresses the, II, 164
 cosmism in the sonnets, II, 162 f.
 cosmology, Sh.'s, I, 321
 cost, rich, proud, I, 169 f.; garments' cost, I, 227 f.; large cost, I, 374, 378
 Costanzo, Angelo di, II, 240
 Cotes, Thomas, II, 19, 378
 Cotgrave, Randle, I, 61, 249
 could (=cold), II, 15
 count the clock, I, 32 f.
 countenance, your, filled his line, I, 217 f.
 counterfeit, imitated, after you, I, 142 f.; your painted, I, 44 f.
 counterpart (=copy), I, 212 f.
 complement of proud compare, I, 60 f. (cf. II, 15)
 couplet, notes on Sh.'s, I, 254, II, 404, 410, 413, 415, 417 f., 421 f., 425, 428 ff., 432, 434 f.; a repeated couplet in Q, I, 104, 238, II, 7, 10, 26 n., 69 f.; sonnet in couplets, I, 319, II, 154
 Courthope, W. J., I, 63, 65, 374, II, 95, 265, 272, 285, 291, 365
 Covell, William, II, 309 f.
 Cowley, Abraham, II, 332
 Cowling, G. H., II, 105, 155, 206
 Cox, E. H., I, 272
 Craig, Alexander, I, 61
 Craig, E. G., II, 141, 246
 Craig, Hardin, II, 219, 338
 Craig, W. J., I, 21
 Cramer, Addison, and Beale, II, 318
 Cranch, C. P., II, 371
 Crandall, C. H., I, 92
 Cranley, Thomas, II, 267
 Crashaw, Richard, I, 375, II, 402
 crave the account, I, 156
 Crawford, Charles, II, 328
 crawls to maturity, I, 160 f.
 Creighton, Charles, I, 215, 311, II, 9, 58, 82, 203, 265, 279 f., 306
 Creizenach, Wilhelm, II, 148
 Creole, the dark woman a, II, 243
 crime, self-doing, I, 157
 Cripps, A. R., II, 185
Critic, I, 334, II, 201
Critical Review, II, 337, 339 f., 344
 Croce, Benedetto, II, 144 n., 219 n., 394, 411
 Croker, J. W., II, 342 f., 355 f.
 crooked eclipses, I, 160 f., II, 434
 Crosby, Joseph, I, 319 f.
 Crosland, T. W. H., I, 56, II, 153 f., 175, 409 f.
 cross, strong offense's, I, 98 f.
 Crossley, Hastings, II, 322
 Crouch, R. A., II, 228
 Crow, Martha F., II, 119
 crowned with you, I, 289
 crowning the present, I, 291 f.
 Crundell, H. W., I, 266
 crushed and o'erworn, I, 167 f. (cf. II, 15)
 cryptograms in Q, II, 229. *See* acrostics; anagrams
Cuba contemporánea, II, 397
Cultura, II, 221
 Cunliffe, J. W., I, 9
 Cunningham, Francis, I, 249

- Cunningham, Peter, II, 221 f., 280, 359 f., 383
 Cupid, the friend, II, 163, 228 f.; and his brand, sonnets on, I, 391-397, II, 144, 157; invocation to, I, 320
 curious (=critical), I, 109
 Curll, Edmund, II, 29 f.
 currall (spelling), II, 15
 Curry, W. C., II, 228
 curse, add a, to your blessings, I, 212 f.
 Cusanus, Nicholas, II, 129
 Cust, Lionel, I, 69 f.
 Cutwoode, T.: see *Caltha*
 cycle, the sonnets as a, II, 46, 84, 423 ff.
 cycles, the, Bruno's doctrine of, I, 158, II, 130; Nature's doctrine of, Ovid on, I, 158 f.
Cymbeline, I, 50, 85, 88, 97, 138, 175, 190, 228, 351, II, 251, 317; parallels with the sonnets, II, 65
 cynicism, Sh.'s, I, 309
 Czerny, Karl, II, 316
- D., Dr., II, 86 f. See Delius
 D., J., *Amours*, II, 53
 D., J., *English Parnassus*, II, 329
 D., S., II, 299
 Dalton, O. M., I, 200
 Dam, B. A. P. van, II, 8 n.
 damask roses, I, 333, 335
 Dana, R. H., II, 368
 Danckelman, Eberhard, Freiherr von, II, 131, 144, 189, 233
 "Dane, Clemence": see Ashton
 Daniel, George, II, 2
 Daniel, Samuel, I, 13, 37, 48, 52, 63, 67, 70, 147, 149, 167, 190, 201, 207, 219, 255, 266, 333, 364, II, 42, 63 n., 255, 327, 394, 430 f.; Drayton's borrowings from, II, 122 f.; part-author of Q, II, 46, 48, 51, 102; relations of, with Pembroke, I, 199, II, 57, 196, 207, 279; the rival poet, II, 117, 196, 277, 279 ff., 293, 373; Sh.'s borrowings from, I, 6, 28, 77, 110, II, 53, 62, 70, 117 ff., 124
 Dannenberg, Friedrich, II, 10 f., 108, 238, 242, 248, 428 f.
 Dante, Alighieri, I, 51, 63, 70, 331, II, 137, 342, 370, 392, 398, 412, 430; the rival poet, II, 288 f.; Sh.'s borrowings from, II, 80, 128, 159, 390
 Danter, John, I, 170
 Darby, R. H., I, 95, 98, 100, II, 62, 309 n.
 Darchini, Lucifero, II, 394
 Darell, Thomas, II, 307
 dark woman, the, discussed, II, 242-276; hair of, like marjoram, I, 247; identified as "Alice," II, 393, as Anglo-Saxon diction, II, 161, as Avisia, II, 303-313, as a blonde, I, 324 f., II, 275, as the Church, the bride of Solomon, II, 157, as Cleopatra, II, 87, 226, as a conventional figure, II, 127, 132, 253 f., as a courtesan, II, 47, 234, 253, 267, 272, as Death and Evil, II, 160, as drama or art, II, 157, 159, as Fitton, II, 190, as Lady Manibetter, II, 56, as Lady Oxford, II, 161, as Lady Rich, II, 89 f., as love of fame, II, 160, as a negress, I, 333, 335, II, 243, 247, as passion, II, 157, as Queen Elizabeth, II, 163, as reality, sensuality, II, 163 f., as sensual love, II, 160, as Sh.'s muse, II, 165, as T. T., II, 174 f., as tragedy, II, 163, as Wine, II, 83; married, I, 390, II, 204, 243, 248, 252, 263 f.; mentioned, II, 6, 25, 55, 133, 147, 150, 220, 225, 238 ff., 327, 360, 414, 417, *et passim*; mistress of Burbage or Kemp, II, 225, or Pembroke, II, 83, 89, or Southampton, II, 60; music named for, II, 314; no early references to, II, 327; plays the virginals, I, 326 ff., II, 267, 269; publishes Q, II, 306; reality or unreality of, II, 133, 152, *et passim*; references, supposed, to, I, 104, 114, 116 ff., 132 f., 183, 300, 302, II, 9 n.; sonnets dealing with, I, 113-120, 323-397, II, 38, 65, 67, 76, 177, 242-248 (see woman; women); ugliness and beauty of, I, 333 f., 336 f., 339, 360, II, 242, 247 f., 251, 263, 271 n., 272; unchaste, II, 126, with married men, I, 364; venereally diseased, I, 371 (cf. II, 258 n.); "vituperated," I, 300, 351, II, 124, 126, 254; voice of, unpleasant or pleasant, I, 327, II, 267; the Wills and, I, 342-350

- Darwin, Erasmus, II, 357
 date (=limit, term), I, 39 f., 50 f.
 date of composition of Q, discussed, II, 53-73; other notes on, I, 39 f., 46, 65, 75 f., 78, 88, 93, 95, 98, 100, 145, 148 f., 170, 176, 199, 234 f., 242, 258, 263-270, 305, 309, 313 f., 320, 353, 368 ff., 377, 392, 395, II, 17, 44 f., 85, 87, 117, 148, 186, 193 f., 196, 200, 205 f., 208-213, 220, 223, 225 f., 228 ff., 248, 257, 259, 260 n., 267 ff., 274 ff., 280-284, 286, 288, 291, 293, 302, 304 n., 306, 308, 309 n., 327 f., *et passim*
 dated sonnets, the two, I, 255, 263, II, 58-61
 dateless, lively heat, I, 391, 394; dateless night, I, 86, 88
 Davenant, Anne Sachfield (Bird), Mrs., the dark woman, II, 101, 209, 270 f., 278, 287, and Avisia, II, 308 f., 311
 Davenant, Jane Shepherd, Mrs., the dark woman, II, 209, 269 ff., 273, 278, and Avisia, II, 307 f., 309 n.
 Davenant, John, II, 270 f., 307 ff.
 Davenant, William, Sir, I, 73, 170, II, 269 ff.
 Davenport, Arnold, I, 10
 Davidson, H. C., II, 367 f. n.
 Davidson, John, II, 365
 Davidson, T., II, 30
 Davidson, Thomas, I, 220
 Davies, C. L., I, 165
 Davies, John, of Hereford, I, 66, 201, 280, 345 f.; the rival poet, II, 284
 Davies, John, Sir, I, 76, 266, 327, 342; satirized in Q, II, 141
 Davies, Randall, II, 173, 195
 Davis, C. K., I, 129, 317
 Davis, Horace, I, 73, 92, 194, 271, 334, II, 64 f., 375
 Davis, Latham, I, 374, II, 45, 106 f., 165, 313 n.
 Davison, Francis, II, 45, 202; the rival poet, II, 284. See *Poetical Rhapsody*
 Davy, John, II, 324 f.
 Dawson, G. E., II, 31 n., 37
 Dawson, George, II, 77
 Day, C. L., II, 21 n.
 days, former, wits of, I, 158 f.; outworn days, I, 179
 deaf heaven, trouble, I, 83 f.
 dear (=especial), I, 363; (=precious), I, 86 f.; dear doting heart, I, 336, dear friend (first use in Q), I, 88 f.; dear my love, I, 35, 38; dear religious love, I, 90 f.
 dearest spite, fortune's, I, 105, 107
 death, dateless night of, I, 86, 88; eternal cold of, I, 35, II, 351; evil and, the dark woman as, II, 273; an executioner, I, 193; feeds on men, I, 374, 378; fell arrest of, I, 192; night and, Sh. on, I, 88, 189, 375; nineteen appearances of, in Q, I, 20; second self of, I, 190 f.; sleep and, I, 190 f.; that churl, I, 92 f.
 deaths, sweet, I, 144 f.
 debate (=quarrel), I, 223 f.; debate between the eye and heart, I, 127 ff., II, 435
 debateth, Time, with decay, I, 41 ff.
 decay, cold, I, 30 f.
 December's bareness, old, I, 239
 Deckner, Elise, I, 266, 305, II, 50, 148, 208
 Decroos, J., II, 109, 395
 dedicated words, I, 208 f., II, 277, 279
 dedication of Q, the, discussed, II, 166-176, 178 ff., *et passim*; its significance, II, 3, 215, 218; omitted by Benson, II, 22, 25, 29, 166, 236
 dedicatory sonnets, II, 177, 203
 Dee, John, I, 218, II, 196, 279
 deep oaths, I, 389 f.
 deepest sense, I, 302 f.
 defeat my rest, I, 163 f.
 defeated me of thee, I, 54, 59, II, 239
 defect, worship thy, I, 383 f.
 defects, frown on my, I, 134
 Defoe, Daniel, II, 308
 deformedst creature, I, 286
 Dehmel, Richard, I, 329
 Delécluze, E. J., II, 247, 390
 Delius, Nikolaus, I, 19, 93, 116, 165, 181, 183, 254, 286, 319, 361, 388, II, 70, 123, 131, 138, 141, 145, 167, 188, 197, 214 f., 384 f., 395. See D. (Dr.)
 delivered from thy brain, I, 198, 200, II, 225
 Dell, Floyd, I, 294
 Della Casa, Giovanni, II, 128, 240
 Deloney, Thomas, I, 14, II, 278
 Delorme, Marion, the dark woman, II, 244 n.

- delves parallels, I, 160 ff., II, 329
 Demblon, Celestin, II, 45
 De Montmorency, J. E. G., II, 160, 273, 279
 Denmark, the sonnets in, II, 396. *See* Hansen (Wilhelm)
 Dennie, Joseph, II, 368
 Denning, W. H., I, 107
 departest (=leavest behind), I, 30 f.
 De Quincey, Thomas, I, 117, 275
 Derby, Earls of: *see* Stanley (Ferdinando, William)
 De Sélincourt, Ernest, II, 341
 desert, deserts (spelling and pronunciation), I, 48, 134 f., 187
 deserved (=would deserve), I, 11
 Deshler, C. D., II, 77
 Desportes, Philippe, I, 190 f., 255, II, 125 f., 254, 278
 determinate, my bonds are, I, 219
 determination (=ending), I, 37
 Deutschbein, Karl, I, 36
 Deutschbein, Max, I, 311, 317, II, 9 n., 162 f.
Deutsche Literaturzeitung, II, 45
Deutsche Rundschau, II, 91, 159, 258
 Devereux, Frances Walsingham Sidney, Countess of Essex, addressed in Q, II, 223; Bacon's dark woman, II, 274
 Devereux, Robert, second Earl of Essex, author of Q, II, 44 f., 106, 165, 182, 313 n., and *Willobie*, II, 313 n.; Best's patron, II, 226; Elizabeth and, Q about, II, 163, 274; enmity of, to Raleigh, II, 273, 310 f.; the friend, II, 92, 223 f., 261, 265, 282 f.; Hervey and, II, 219; "Hews" refers to, II, 185; mentioned, I, 201, II, 274, 288; sonnets addressed to, II, 178; sonnets referring to, I, 73, 266, 313 ff., II, 9 n., 59; Southampton and, II, 56 f., 187 n., 194, 208
 Devereux, W. B., II, 181 f.
 Devereux, Walter, first Earl of Essex, author of the sonnets, II, 44, 182; Hewes and, II, 181 ff.
 Devonshire, Countess of: *see* Cavendish (Christian); Earl of: *see* Blount (Charles); Cavendish (William)
 Devrient, Otto, II, 244 f., 253, 257 ff., 384
Dial (Boston), II, 370
Dial (Chicago), II, 112, 270, 308
 dial in a table-book, I, 198 ff.; dial hand, I, 255 f.
 dialect words or forms in Q, I, 99, 117. *See* verb-form
 dialogs, the sonnets Bacon's, II, 164 f.
 Diamante, Nashe's, the dark woman, II, 271
 Dian's maid, I, 391, II, 157
 "Diary, David," II, 243 f., 368
 Díaz, L. M., II, 397 n.
 Dibdin, Charles, II, 34
 dictating, misprint caused by, I, 378. *See* misprints
Dictionary of American Biography, II, 371 n.
Dictionary of National Biography, II, 144 f., 186, 187 n., 189 f., 193, 199 ff., 209, 210 n., 219 n., 227, 262, 263 n., 264 f., 274, 290, 305 n.
 difference (=variety), I, 257 f.
 Digges, Leonard, II, 19
 dignified, therein, I, 250
 Dilke, C. W., II, 77
 Dindorf, Wilhelm, I, 220
 dipsomaniac, Sh. a, II, 83, 160 f., 273, 284. *See* disgrace
 directly (=exactly) tell, I, 368, 370
 Direy, Louis, II, 391 n.
 disabled (pronunciation), I, 176
 discloses, masked buds, I, 144 f., II, 330
 disgrace, salve that cures not the, I, 98 f.; Sh.'s disgrace, I, 83 f., 95 f., 103 f., 188, 276, 280, 283 f. (*see* guilt; immorality; scandal); time disgrace, I, 319, 321
 disgusting sonnets, Q's, I, 298, II, 412. *See* bad; obscenity
 "dislegomena," Sh.'s, II, 65
 dispense with, I, 283 f.
 disperse, their poesy, I, 201, II, 277
 Disraeli, Isaac, II, 338 n., 359
 dissection, anatomical, Sh. on, I, 193
 distempered, sad, guest, I, 391, 395
 distillation, summer's, I, 17 f.
 divining eyes, I, 260 f.
 Dix, E. R. McC., II, 31 n.
 Dixon, T. S. E., II, 163
do vs. *doth* (q. v.), Sh.'s use of, II, 68
 Dobell, Bertram, I, 8, 10
 doctor-like, folly, I, 174, 176
 Dodd, Alfred, I, 374, II, 107, 164, 175, 243 n., 275

- Dodge, R. E. N., I, 126
Döring, August, II, 202 f.
dog-rose, wild, I, 144 f.
Donne, John, I, 93, 375, II, 255, 349, 402, 407, 428, 430, 433 f., 436; part-author of Q, II, 48, 102; rival for the dark woman, II, 267 n.
Donnelly, Ignatius, I, 53, II, 54, 58, 167, 244, 373, 403
doom, confined, I, 263, 269, II, 274; edge of, I, 293, 295; gentle, I, 372 f.
Dorrell, D., II, 307 n.
Dorrell, Hadrian, II, 295 ff., 299-303, 305 n., 307 f., 312
Doten, Lizzie, II, 374
doth vs. *do*, Sh.'s use of, II, 68; *doth* as a plural, I, 111 f., 283, 310
double vantage me, I, 221 f.
doubting (=fearing), I, 194 f.
Douce, Francis, I, 200
Douglas, Alfred, Lord, I, 56, 83, 369, 373, II, 6, 25, 47, 50, 58, 106, 184, 212, 237 f., 286 n., 366
Douglas, M. W., II, 107
Douglas, Noel, II, 2
Douse, T. Le M., I, 75, 176
Dove, J. F., II, 355
Dover, chalk cliffs of, I, 170
Dowdall, John, I, 106
Dowden, Edward, I, 9, 11, 13, 15-19, 21 f., 24 f., 28, 30-33, 35-40, 45 f., 49 f., 57 f., 62, 66 f., *et passim*, II, 6, 18 n., 37 n., 70, 79 f., 91, 95, 97, 117 f., 142 f., 170 f., 173, 181, 185, 197 f., 204, 230, 242, 250, 285, 293, 303, 305, 367, 393 f., 404 f.
Dowland, John, II, 314
Downing, Charles, II, 159 f., 198, 215, 228, 272
Doysié, Abel, II, 391 n.
Drake, Nathan, I, 75 f., II, 53, 117, 135, 166 f., 177, 179, 181, 186 ff., 194, 196 f., 244, 253, 256, 301, 348, 352, 382
drama, Sh.'s view of, Q about, II, 157
dramatic, Sh.'s sonnets, II, 25, 88 ff., 92, 102, 135, 240, 246, 256, 260 f., *et passim*. See conventions
Drant, Thomas, II, 249
Drayton, Michael, I, 63, 69, 109, 147, 149, 197, II, 117, 287, 394, 413, 422; relation of his sonnets to Sh.'s, I, 10, 128, 167, 206, 268, 361, 369 f., II, 62, 121 ff., 141, 280; revisions of his sonnets, II, 84 f., 121; the rival poet, II, 226, 277, 280 f., 284, 287, 289, 293; satirized in Q, II, 141
dream, as a, doth flatter, I, 219 f.
dreaming on things to come, I, 263, 269, II, 420
dressing old words new, I, 196, II, 125
dressings of a former sight, I, 309 f.
Drew, Elizabeth, I, 376
Dring, William, I, 225
Droeshout, Martin, II, 19
drop in (=call), I, 225
drudge, poor, I, 387
Drummond, William, of Hawthornden, I, 79, 93, 258, II, 326 f., 347 f., 350, 355 f., 386, 400, 406, 430
drunkard, Sh. a: see dipsomaniac
Dryden, John, I, 18
Du Bellay, Joachim, I, 63, 124, 149
Dubeux, Albert, II, 378
Dubislav, Georg, I, 101, 194 f.
Dublin *Evening Mail*, II, 214 n.
Dublin Magazine, I, 40, II, 335 n.
Dublin Review, II, 77, 343
Dudley, Robert, Earl of Leicester, Elizabeth and, in Q, II, 92, 261 n.; his son (Bacon, *q. v.*) writes Q, II, 164
due of many, that, I, 90 f.
Dünwald, Willi, II, 266
Dufay, Pierre, I, 84
Duggan, John, II, 164, 275, 283 f.
dull bearer, my, I, 137; dull a cheer, so, I, 239 f.; dull substance, I, 123 f.; dull you with my song, I, 252 f.
dulling my lines, I, 254
dullness, perpetual, I, 152
dully, plods on, I, 136
Dumas, Alexandre, père, II, 390
dumb presagers, I, 25, 65; my dumb thoughts, I, 214
Dunbar, William, I, 334
Duncombe, John, II, 331
Dunning, E. J., II, 160
Durrell, Henry, II, 36
dust of age, I, 271, II, 426
Dutch translations of Q, II, 88, 395. See Holland
dwellers on, I, 315 f.
Dyce, Alexander, I, 24, 53, 70, 82, 96, 98, 107, 109, 116, 121, 134, 141, 146, 179, 202, 211, 218, 227, 271, 279,

- 284 f., 317, 325, 327, 338, 352, 361, II, 135 ff., 139, 145, 168 f., 233, 240, 248, 279, 344, 356, 372 n., 406
 Dyer, Edward, Sir, the friend (of Sidney—"Sh."), II, 45, 229 f., 273 f.; part-author of Q, II, 46
 Dyer, Isabelle Archer, Memorial Talking Book, II, 376 n.
 dyer's hand, like the, I, 279, 281, II, 46, 229 n., 426
- each (=each other), I, 368, 371
 eager compounds, I, 298 f.
 Eagle, R. L. (Roderick), II, 54, 164, 265, 275, 280
 Earle, Edward, II, 36 n.
 ears, mad, I, 358
 earth, my sinful, I, 374, 376
 Earwaker, J. P., II, 263 n.
 ease (=inn), I, 136
 eat (=ate), I, 244, 247
 Ebisch, Walther, II, 50 n.
 Ebsworth, J. W., I, 338
 Eccles, Mark, I, 265, 267, II, 291. *See* look
 Eckhardt, Eduard, II, 45
Eclectic Magazine, II, 373
 eclipse, her, endured, I, 263-269
 eclipses, actual, referred to, I, 264, 266 f., 269, II, 62; clouds and, I, 100, II, 62; crooked, I, 160 f.
 Eddington, A. S., Sir, II, 112
 Edel, Marie Louise, II, 295 n.
 Edgar, Eleazar, II, 53, 55
Edinburgh Review, II, 340, 345, 349 f., 359
 Edmonds, Charles, II, 169, 216 n.
Education, II, 264
Edward III, The Reign of King, I, 96, 170, 234 f., 290, 364, II, 63, 329
 Edwards, H. L. R., II, 288
 Edwards, Thomas, II, 331, 344
 effect, love's sole, I, 103 f.
 effectually (=in fact), I, 286 f.
 Egerton, F. H., eighth Earl of Bridgewater, II, 2, 5
 Eichhoff, Theodor, I, 189, 225, 293, II, 47 f., 190 n., 259, 387
 Eichler, Albert, II, 380
 eisel, I, 266; potions of, I, 279, 281 f.
 either (pronunciation), I, 185
 either's reign, enemies to, I, 81
 Eld, George, I, 238, II, 1, 5, 335
 elder (form), I, 63 f.
 elements, the four, sonnets on, I, 123-126
 Eliot, T. S., II, 49, 155
 Elizabeth, Queen, addressed in all the sonnets, II, 222, 247 ff., or part of them, II, 159, 222, 249 n., 257 f., 261 n., 273 f., 278; death of, sonnet on, I, 264-270, II, 59, 71; Dee and, II, 196; Essex and, in Q, II, 163, 274 (*see* Devereux, Robert); Fitton and, II, 210, 262; her hair and wigs, I, 180, 335; her son (Bacon) reproaches, in Q, II, 164 f., 275; her son, by Oxford, the friend, II, 165, 184, 230; Leicester and, in Q, II, 92; mentioned, I, 22, 175, II, 157, 192, 280, 394 n.; Pembroke's relations with, II, 211, 213, 262; rival-poet sonnets concern, II, 249 n., 257, 278; Southampton's relations with, II, 57, 62 n., 194; Tasso's patron, II, 289 f.; visit to Bath, sonnet on her, I, 392
 Elizabethan Club, Yale, II, 2, 5
 Ellacombe, H. N., I, 74, 145, 232, 247
 Elliott, Ebenezer, II, 343
 ellipses in the sonnets, I, 172 f., 211, 218
 Ellis, A. J., on Sh.'s pronunciation (*q. v.*), I, 48, 59, 163, 228, 303, 373
 Ellis, Charles, I, 369
 Ellis, F. S., II, 222
 Ellis, George, II, 301
 Ellis-Fermor, Una M., II, 282
 Elmen, P. H., I, 59
 Elson, L. C., I, 24
 Elton, C. I., I, 64, 99
 Elton, Oliver, I, 41, 214, II, 97, 123, 130
 Elze, Karl, I, 11, II, 56, 142, 188, 197, 213, 269, 386
 emblems, Sh. and, I, 7, 172
 Emerson, E. W., II, 369
 Emerson, O. F., I, 264, II, 67, 83
 Emerson, R. W., II, 138, 244, 369-372, 435
 Emet, Abell, II, 296 f.
 Empson, William, I, 233; on Sh.'s ambiguity, I, 38, 46, 93, 119 f., 190, 206 f., 210; on W. H., II, 232 n.
Encyclopaedia Britannica, II, 130
 end: fiend (rime), I, 372 f.
 endeared with all hearts, I, 90

- endstopped lines, Sh.'s, II, 421. *See* run-on; scansion
- Endymion, sonnet on, I, 320
- England's Helicon*, I, 290, II, 21, 39
- England's Parnassus*, II, 193, 197, 328
- Englische Studien*, I, 36 f., 44 ff., 53, 69, 71, 96, 100, 114, 147, 158, 173 f., 191, 206, 263, 267, 314, 347, II, 25, 26 n., 50, 61, 91, 95, 99, 104, 106, 127 f., 132, 142 f., 147, 152, 155, 177, 221, 233, 240, 254, 285, 292, 311 n., 366 n., 380, 387, 398
- English Association, *Essays*, I, 10, II, 293, 437
- English Review*, I, 107
- English Studies*, I, 330, II, 50, 221, 237
- engraft, I, you new, I, 41, 43
- engrafted to this store, I, 105, 107
- engrossed (=captured), I, 340
- enimes (spelling), II, 15
- enjambement, Sh.'s, I, 167, 291, II, 414. *See* scansion
- enjoyer, proud as an, I, 194 f.
- enlarged, evermore, I, 183, 185
- enmity, all-oblivious, I, 147, 151
- Ennius, I, 207
- ensconce, I, 134 f.
- ensuing sonnets, these, I, 3, II, 168, 172 f., 216 f., 230
- entertain the time, to, I, 111 f.
- entitled in thy parts, I, 105, 107
- entombed in men's eyes, I, 206 f.
- enueg, Sh.'s, I, 174
- envoys or finales, sonnets as, I, 75, 77, 92, 194, 199, 320, II, 76, 79, 81-84, 96, 99 f., 190. *See* arrangement
- envy, I, 16, 326 f.; envy evermore enlarged, I, 183, 185
- epigrams, sonnets called, II, 332 f., made from, I, 396, or resembling, II, 400 f., 411, 414
- epitaph, I, 206, II, 8 n.
- equipage, ranks of better, I, 92 ff.
- Erasmus, Desiderius, I, 7, 18, II, 131, 192
- Erdmann, Axel, I, 199
- Eromena*, I, 150, II, 330
- Eros, warm bath of, I, 393 f.
- escape mechanism, Sh.'s, I, 119
- Eschenburg, J. J., II, 43, 76, 230, 378-381
- Esdaile, Ada McD., Mrs., II, 19 n.
- España moderna*, II, 396 n.
- Espiner-Scott, Janet G., I, 25, 70, 101, 128, 394, II, 27, 43, 118, 121, 124-128, 132, 153, 158 f., 292 n.
- Esquerra, Ramón, II, 397
- essays, worse, I, 275, 277
- Essex, Earls of: *see* Devereux
- Essex, William, II, 292
- est in double superlatives, I, 205
- esteem, false, slandering with, I, 323, 325
- estimate (=price), I, 219
- Etherington, C., II, 31
- ethical dative, I, 115. *See* grammar
- eugenic marriage (g. v), Sh. on, I, 6
- euphuism, Sh.'s love for, I, 349, II, 146, 373, 376, 428; attacked, I, 60, 196. *See* style
- Euripides, II, 131
- Evans, Edith, II, 376 n.
- Evans, G. F., II, 331
- Evans, Judge, I, 6
- Evans, Mary, II, 346
- Evans, Sebastian, I, 374, 377
- Evans, Thomas, his edition of the sonnets, II, 22 n., 38, 40, described, II, 32 f.
- Evans, Willa McC., I, 293, II, 211, 323
- Everett, Edward, II, 368
- ever-fixed mark, I, 293 f.
- everliving poet, our, I, 3, II, 168 f., 171-174, 179, 215, 221
- evermore, not, I, 103 f.
- Eve's apple, I, 231 f., II, 110
- Ewig, Wilhelm, I, 128, 175, 245, II, 124
- Ewing, Thomas, his edition of the sonnets, II, 30, 38, 40, 75, 335, described, II, 31
- except, physic did, I, 379 f.
- excess, this, inheritors of, I, 374, 378
- exchanged, not with the time, I, 273 f.
- exchequer but his, no, I, 177 f.
- expense (=loss), I, 233 f.; expense of spirit, I, 329, 331, II, 421; moan the expense, I, 86, 88
- expiate (=end), I, 63 f.
- extant (=alive), I, 210 f.
- extern, my, I, 315 f. (cf. II, 44)
- extremity, swift, I, 137
- eye, beams of the, assemble, I, 289; drown an eye, I, 86 f.; each under

- eye, I, 21; eye of heaven (=the sun), I, 50 f.; eye of scorn, I, 221; heart and eye, war of, I, 127-129, ended, I, 130; my eye is in my mind, I, 286; my famished eye, I, 130; sovereign eye, I, 95 f.; sun's eye, I, 73 f.; thine eye, that sun, I, 134 f. eyes (=eyeing), I, 26; false, adulterate eyes, I, 304 f.; gave eyes to blindness, I, 389 f.; eyes so suited, I, 323 ff.
- faculty to subsist, I, 307
Faetanus, Matthaeus, I, 394
faint (=feel discouraged), I, 204
fair (=beauty), I, 44, 47, 50 f., 60 f., 179, 210; black not fair, I, 323 f., 336; fair, kind, and true, I, 257 ff., II, 158 f., 425
Fairchild, A. H. R., I, 71 f., 79, 108, 143, 150, 177, 190
Fairfax, Edward, I, 187, II, 290
fairing (participle), I, 323
fairly (=in beauty), I, 17
Falk, Hjalmar, *Festskrift*, II, 254
Fallopian, I, 193
Falstaff, the dark woman and, II, 272
fame his wit, I, 212 f.
famines, references to, I, 39
famished for a look, the eye, I, 130
famoused, I, 17, 73 f.
Fantoni, Giovanni, I, 51
Farinelli, Arturo, II, 128 n.
Farjeon, Herbert, II, 436
Farmer, Richard, I, 177 f., 380, II, 2, 180 f., 334 f.
Farmers' Museum, II, 368
Farnell, F. J., II, 266
Farr, Henry, II, 5 n., 19, 29 n.
farthest earth removed, I, 123 f.
fate, Sh.'s, Q predicts, II, 228
Faulder, R., II, 40
Fauquemerge et de Courtenay, Comte de, II, 126
Faustus, Dr., History of, I, 325
fear of trust, for, I, 65 f.
fearing of, I, 291 f.
Fearon, George, I, 207, II, 227 n.
feast with, to, I, 130
feasting on, I, 130, 194
feasts, solemn and rare, I, 140 f.
feathers, have added, I, 201 f.
Feely, J. M., II, 175 n.
Fehr, B., II, 252 n.
female evil, my, I, 368, 370, II, 272
Ferenczi, Zoltán, II, 397
feres, I, 313
Ferguson, F. S., II, 295
Ferrari, Demetrio, II, 392
Ferrers, Henry, part-author of Q, II, 47
fester, lilies that, I, 233 ff. *See* lilies
Feuchtwanger, Lion, I, 175
Feuillerat, Albert, *Essays in Honor of*, II, 300 n., 301 n., 312
fever, my love is a, I, 379
fiction, poetry, and drama, the sonnets in, II, 186, 196 n., 230, 238, 239 n., 244 n., 248, 249 n., 266 n., 267 n., 271, 313 n., 380. *See* titles of books
fictitious, the sonnet characters, II, 239 ff., 256, 292. *See* literary exercises
Fidessa, the dark woman, II, 292
Field, Jacqueline Vautrollier, Mrs., the dark woman, II, 209, 268 f.
Field, Richard, II, 130, 268 f.
Fields, J. T., II, 373
fiend ('finde'), my angel turned a, I, 368, II, 15; fiend: end (rime), I, 372 f.
Figgis, Darrell, II, 147, 251
figure of a dial or clock, I, 255 f.
figures of delight, I, 241 ff.
filed, precious phrase, I, 214 ff., II, 279, 280 n., 281, 286
Filon, Augustin, II, 70, 130, 158, 170, 234, 264 n., 391
finde: *see* fiend
finest line in Q, I, 87, 225, 261, 268 f.; finest quatrain in Q, I, 53; finest sonnets in Q, I, 50, 84, 90, 169, 174 f., 189, 192, 225, 246, 294, 331, 383, II, 350 n., 364, 413, 421 f.
Finney, C. L., I, 33, 169, 334, II, 351
Fird(o)usi, I, 51
fire, purging, I, 125; fire out (with venereal disease), I, 368, 371
Firkins, O. W., II, 371 n.
First Folio, Sh.'s, II, 160, 332; the dark woman as, II, 275; dedicated to the Pembrokes, II, 195 f., 200 f., 205 f., 211, one of whom edits it, II, 274
Firth, C. H., Sir, II, 339
Fischer, J., II, 317
Fischer, Rudolf, II, 103 f.

- fitted, eyes been, I, 300 f.
 Fitton, Alice Holcroft, Lady, II, 262
 Fitton, Anne, Lady Newdigate, II, 262; the dark woman, II, 262 f. n.
 Fitton, Edward, Sir, II, 262
 Fitton, Mary, I, 345, II, 58, 268, 270, 273, 275, 278; discussed, II, 262-267; Pembroke and, II, 57, 190, 198 ff., 202 ff., 206-210
 "Fitzadam, Ismael": *see* Macken (John)
 Fitzgerald, Edward, II, 343, 356
 Fitzgerald, Elizabeth: *see* Geraldine
 five hundred courses, I, 158 f., II, 292; five wits, I, 360 f., II, 421
 fixed, with his color, I, 250
 flame, full, most, I, 291; my flame to qualify, I, 273
 Flathe, J. L. F., I, 280, II, 231, 383
 flatter, as a dream doth, I, 219 f.; flatter the mountain tops, I, 95 f., II, 421, 426
 Flatter, Richard, I, 248, 271 f., 295, 346, II, 203 n., 208, 246, 248, 252, 385, 387
 flattery, the monarch's plague, I, 289
 Fleay, F. G., I, 7, 39, 67, 78, 88, 98, 160, 167, 188, 197 f., 223, 234, 239, 265, 276, 361, 363, 370, 389 f., II, 55, 58 f., 62 n., 78, 121 f., 170, 174, 188, 190 n., 215, 220, 269, 277, 280, 288 f., 303 f., 338
 fleets (=fleetest), I, 52 f.
 Fleischer, Ernst, II, 383
 flesh, dull, neigh no, I, 137 ff.
 Fletcher, Giles, I, 394 f., II, 124
 Fletcher, John, II, 21
 Flora, Francesco, II, 129
 Florio, John, I, 140, 201, 337, 375; collector of Q, II, 101; Mrs. Davenant and, II, 270; the rival poet, II, 281, 289 f.
 Florus, Publius Annius, I, 330
 flourish set on youth, I, 160 f.
 flowers, your living, I, 44 f.
 Förster, Max, II, 98 n., 270, 308
 foison of the year, I, 142 f., II, 330
 foist upon us, I, 309 f.
 foles (spelling), II, 15
 Foley, Henry, II, 212 n.
 Folger, H. C., II, 2, 5
 folly, doctor-like, I, 174, 176
 fond on praise, I, 212 f.
 fools of time, I, 311, 313 f. (cf. II, 15)
 for (=because), I, 113 f., 145, 261; (=on account of), I, 246 f.; for we (=for even we), I, 260, 262
 Forbes, W. E., II, 369
 Forbis, F. J., II, 83, 160 f., 175, 273, 284
 Ford, H. L., II, 29 n., 30, 333
 Ford, John, I, 218
 fore (=before), I, 21 f.
 fore-bemoaned moan, I, 86, 88, II, 422
 foregone, grievances, I, 86, 88
 forfeit to a confined doom, I, 263, 269, II, 274
 forlorn world, I, 95, 97
 form and favor, I, 315 f.
 Forman, H. B., I, 225
 former days, wits of, I, 158 f.
 Formichi, Carlo, I, 331
 Forrest, H. T. S., II, 48, 102 f., 283, 291, 366
 forrwes (spelling), II, 15, 18 n.
 forsake themselves (=change for the worse), I, 32 f.
 forsworn, twice, I, 389 f. (cf. 114)
 Forsyth, Ebenezer, II, 140, 216
 Fort, J. A., I, 8 f., 12, 30, 43, 46, 69, 118, 151, 230, 238, 245 f., 264 f., 269, 283, 288, 302, 310-313, 316, 321, 346 f., 367, 369, 371, 373 f., 378, 395, II, 10, 50, 59 ff., 63 n., 65, 83, 104, 170, 174, 193, 207, 218 f., 246
 fortify, I now do, I, 167 f.
Fortnightly Review, I, 39, 46, 148, 200, 312, 315, 342, 345, 350, 367, 393, II, 54, 66, 90, 142, 145, 172, 189 f., 194, 199 f., 260, 264
 fortune, chide with, I, 279, 281; the dark woman as, II, 275; Sh.'s views of, II, 162 f., 273; fortune's bastard, I, 311 f.; fortune's dearest spite, I, 105, 107; spite of, I, 225
 forty (=indefinite number), I, 11
 forward violet, I, 244, 246
 Forward, Avice (Avys), II, 307
 Foster, Joseph, II, 303 n.
 foul as hell, I, 300; foul face, I, 338, 351; foul faults, I, 381; foul pride, I, 368, 370
 Foxe, John, I, 313
 frame (=form), I, 17; composed wonder of your frame, I, 158 f.
 Frame, Beatrice Barnstorff, II, 161 f., 215 f., 385

- France, English treaty with, I, 264 f.;
the sonnets in, II, 388-392. *See*
French; Sauguet
- Francis, David, II, 34 ff.
- Françon, Marcel, II, 255
- frank and free, I, 15
- Frankfurter Zeitung*, II, 172, 217, 265
- Franklin, Julia, II, 386
- Franklyn, C. W., II, 141
- Franz, Wilhelm, on Sh.'s grammar
(*q. v.*), I, 7, 11, 16, 18, 27, 31, 36 ff.,
42, 64, 66 f., 91, 99, 104, 107, 115,
117, 130 f., 134, 140, 150, 155, 157,
160, 166, 172, 184 f., 193, 201, 207,
227, 236, 274, 282, 284, 289, 310,
321, 331
- Fraser's Magazine*, I, 119, II, 167, 222,
241, 361
- Frazer, Robert, II, 195, 237 n.
- free, frank and, I, 15
- Fréjaville, Gustave, I, 56
- French sonneteers, conventions of, in
Sh., II, 152, 254 f. (*see* Desportes;
Jamyn; Jodelle; Marot; Ronsard);
French translations of the sonnets,
I, 50, 55, 90, 293, II, 389-392 (*see*
France)
- frequent (=intimate), I, 296, II, 428
- fresh repair, I, 12
- Friedrichs, Ernst, II, 398
- friend*, a stronger term than *love*, I,
89
- friend, the, of the sonnets, discussed,
II, 177-241 (*see also* 166-176); ab-
sent, I, 111, 124, 152, 156 f., in the
spring, I, 241, for three years, I,
273; apologies, Sh.'s, for not writing
about, I, 211, 214, 217 f., 248, 250,
for three years, I, 246, 248 (cf. 255
f.), 273; birthday of, sonnet on, II,
60, 212; contradictions in the
character of, I, 143, 183 f., 203, 221,
258, 320, II, 110, 177 f.; father of,
alive or dead, I, 26, 28 f., 38, II,
204, 223; first written about by Sh.,
I, 201; hair of, like marjoram, I,
247; high in rank, I, 100, 104, 107,
II, 231 f.; identified as classical
diction, II, 161, as a conventional
figure, II, 127, 132, 240 f., as Cupid,
II, 163, 228 f., as a defense of poetry
and the stage, II, 159, as Dyer, II,
45, as ideal beauty, II, 158 ff., as
imaginary, II, 86, 152, 239 ff., *et*
passim, as life and goodness, II,
160, as love of beauty, II, 160, as a
microcosm, II, 162 f., as more than
one man (*see* men), II, 100, as
Oxford's baby, II, 161, as Oxford's
illegitimate sons, II, 46, 108, 165,
275 f., as reason, II, 157, as Sh.
himself, II, 44, 163 f., 214 ff., 224,
as Sh.'s alter ego, II, 164, as Sh.'s
divine or poetic ideal, II, 157, 160,
as Sh.'s genius, II, 157, 163 ff.,
214, as Sh.'s patron, I, 201, 203,
208 f., 217 f., II, 145, 162, 177 f.,
186, 199, 201, 203, 211, 291, as
Sh.'s spiritual being, II, 159, 169,
as the son of Sh. and Beauty, II,
162, as the soul materialized, II,
157, as spiritual love, II, 159 f., as
Will, a poet, II, 160, as Wine, II,
83, 160 f., as a woman, II, 75, 136,
224, 291, as "X.," II, 48 f.; letter
from, to Sh., I, 126; love of, Sh.'s,
idolatrous, II, 359, and pure, II, 25,
137, 147; mentioned, II, 6, 18, 25,
133, 145, 147, 150, 327, 414 f., 417,
423, *et passim*; mother of, alive, I,
26, 38, II, 223; no early references
to, II, 327; not noble, II, 168, 171,
179, 231 f., *et passim*; Platonic con-
ception of, II, 131; portrait of, given
to Sh., I, 128, 130; rival poet(s) and,
I, 201-205, 208-218 (*see* rival); sins
of, against Sh., I, 95 f., 98, 100 ff.,
302 f.; sonnet-contest of, with Sh.,
II, 49; sonnets dealing with, dis-
cussed, II, 76-85, 177, *et passim*
(*see* addressees); table-book, he and
Sh. make gifts of a, I, 198 f., 307;
wins Sh.'s mistress, I, 113-120 (*see*
dark woman); wrinkles of, I, 272
- friendship, conventions of, I, 113 f.,
343, 369, II, 232 ff., 235-241, 292.
See conventions; love
- Fries, C. C., II, 17 n.
- Friesen, Hermann, Freiherr von, II,
63, 118, 141, 383
- Fripp, E. I., I, 8, 102, 263, 306, 322,
347, 394 n., 395, II, 61, 84, 124, 173,
192, 195, 219, 248, 272, 312
- from (= far from), I, 370; from hence,
I, 206 f.
- fruit, unfathered, I, 239 f.
- Fucilla, J. G., II, 394 n.
- Fulda, Karl, I, 88, 309, II, 141

- Fulda, Ludwig, I, 273, II, 147, 385
 Fuller, Thomas, II, 18 n., 283
 Fullom, S. W., II, 247, 249 n., 256 f., 279
 Furness, H. H., I, 106, II, 375
 Furness, H. H., Mrs., I, 29, II, 68 n.
 Furnivall, F. J., I, 23, 54, 70, 92, 139, 193, 374, 376, II, 70, 78 f., 142, 183, 198, 201, 211, 222, 231, 242, 263 f., 284 f., 314
 furrows, time's, I, 63 f. (cf. II, 15, 18 n.)
 fury (=enthusiasm), I, 248
 G., the rival poet, II, 50, 293
 Gadski, Johanna, II, 316
 Gaehde, Christian, II, 128
 Gätschenberger, Stephan, II, 197, 386
 gain, my loss is my love's, I, 119 f.
 Gamble, John, II, 323
 Garlanda, Federico, II, 144 n., 394
 Garnett, Henry, Father, II, 212 n.
 Garnett, Richard, I, 176, II, 305 n.
 Garnier, C.-M., I, 346, II, 98 n., 391 f.
 Garrick, David, I, 275, II, 350
 Garrigues, Gertrude, II, 143, 279
 Gascoigne, George, I, 9, 189 f., 334, II, 141, 431
 gaudy, I, 9
 gaze, lovely, I, 17
Gegenwart, II, 44, 182, 274
Geisteswissenschaften, *Die*, II, 305 n.
 Gelbcke, F. A., II, 90, 140, 260, 383
 Genée, Rudolph, I, 266, II, 70, 152, 191, 258, 387 f.
 general evil, I, 304, 306; general of hot desire, I, 396
 genitive, Sh.'s old, I, 150 f.
 genius, Sh.'s, sonnets addressed to, I, 320, II, 157
 Gentili, Scipio, II, 290
 Gentleman, Francis, his edition of the sonnets, II, 33 ff., 38, 40, 75, 335, 348, 353, described II, 31 f.
Gentleman's Magazine, I, 100, 104, 182, 277, 322, 371, 387, II, 6, 34, 37 n., 46 f., 77, 79, 85, 93, 134, 136, 143, 167, 177, 187, 195, 198, 203, 217, 256, 339, 342, 352, 355 ff., 363 f.
 George, A. J., I, 268
 George, Stefan, I, 273, 374, II, 10, 385, 387 f., 408
 Geraldine, Fair (Elizabeth Fitzgerald), and Surrey, I, 61, II, 209
 Gerbel, N. B., II, 398
 Gerbel, N. W., II, 398
 German translations of the sonnets, I, 273, 329, II, 378-388. *See* Beer-Walbrunn; Germany; Parry (C. H. H.)
Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift, II, 63 n., 84, 423
 Germany, the sonnets in, II, 377-388. *See* German; Wittenberg
 Gerstfeldt, Olga von, II, 385
 Gervinus, G. G., I, 258, II, 70, 77, 142, 179, 187, 363, 383
Gesta Grayorum, II, 272
 get (=beget), I, 21 f.
 ghost, Sh.'s, poems by, II, 52, 149 f., 235 f., 239, 374. *See* affable
 Gibbon, Edward, II, 428
 Gibson, John, II, 193
 Gide, André, II, 184, 423
Gids, De, II, 214, 395
Gids, De Nieuwe, II, 395
 Gielgud, John, II, 376 n.
 Gifford, William, I, 82, 249
 Gildemeister, Otto, I, 6, 378, II, 70, 141, 145, 318, 320, 324, 385
 Gildersleeve, B. L., *Studies in Honor of*, I, 11 f., 32 f., 37, 41, 54, 86, 163, II, 67 n., 145
 gildest the even, I, 81 f.
 gilding the eye, I, 54, 58; gilding pale streams, I, 95 f.
 Gildon, Charles, I, 11, 277, 376, II, 22 n., 75, 243, 330; his editions of the sonnets, II, 29 f., 133, 332 ff., Lintott on, II, 37 f.
 Gilfillan, George, II, 402
 Gillet, Louis, II, 61, 148, 232, 237, 252, 422 f.
 Giltinan, Caroline, II, 266 n.
 girded up in sheaves, I, 32 f.
 Gissing, George, I, 218, II, 80, 364
 Glass, T. O. W., I, 10
 glazed with thine eyes, I, 69, 72
 Gleichen-Russwurm, Alexander von, II, 124 f.
 gloom and misery, Sh.'s, II, 416, 423. *See* melancholy
 Gloria Patri, I, 258
 gluttoning on all, I, 194 f.
 go (=walk), I, 137, 139, 333, 335; go wide, I, 358 f.

- god in love, I, 275, 278
goddess, guilty, I, 279, 281
Godefroi, Jocelyn, II, 184
God's goodness and truth, Q deals with, II, 159
Godwin, Parke, I, 5 f., 12, 21, 23, 32, 54, 59, 121, 144, 154, 217, 219, 229, 244, 260, 263, 267, 284, 286, 311, 340, 363, 374, II, 58, 173, 215, 247, 282, 305, 338 n.; rearranges the sonnets, I, 192, II, 94 f., 259
Goedeke, Karl, I, 35, II, 91, 159, 247, 258
Goethe, J. W. von, I, 86, 175, II, 83, 146, 153, 188, 222 n., 256, 258, 417
Göttingen University, *Nachrichten*, II, 54, 71, 151, 173, 174 n., 180
Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen, II, 382
Golding, Arthur, I, 42, 52, 99, 111, 123, 148, 158-161, 168, 170 f., 321, II, 132; the rival poet, II, 290
Gollancz, Israel, Sir, I, 70, 134, 138, 148, 184, 207, 265, 277, 361, II, 24, 55, 59, 80 f., 97, 121 f., 189, 199, 215 n., 285, 304
Good Housekeeping, II, 271 n.
Goodwin, Gordon, I, 94, 96
"Gordon, George": see Baldwin (C. C.)
gored my thoughts, I, 275 ff., II, 426
Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Inventions, I, 88
Gosse, Edmund, Sir, I, 394 n., II, 305 n., 363
Gotch, J. A., I, 190
Gottlieb, H. J., II, 329
Goudge, Elizabeth, II, 271 n.
Goulburn, E. M., II, 197 n.
Goulding, D'Almaine, and Potter, II, 321
Goulding, R. W., II, 219 n.
Gower, John, I, 170 f.
Grabau, Carl, I, 394
grace, lascivious, I, 113, 115, 117; the poet of grace, I, 202, II, 277
gracious (pronunciation), I, 344, 347 f.; (=beautiful), I, 165; my gracious numbers, I, 203
grammar, Sh.'s, notes on, I, 24, 53, 61, 97, 111 f., 133, 168, 180, 197, 200, 221, 233, 254, 256, 287, 305, 310, 316, 339, 361, 390, II, 68. See Abbott; adjective; asyndeton; *do*; Franz; happies; *has*; like; look; negatives; other; plural verbs; relative; -s; -th; ye
grant (=be it granted), I, 28
Grant, Robert, II, 253
Granville-Barker, H. G., II, 427
grave, by the, and thee, I, 5, 9; common grave, I, 206 f.
graves, mouthed, I, 198 f., II, 178
Graves, Robert, I, 331 f., II, 366
gravity, settled, I, 134 f.
Gray, A. K., II, 187 n.
Gray, Arthur, II, 173
Gray, H. D., I, 56, 69, 208, 266, II, 59, 62, 70 f., 98 f., 179, 185, 213, 248, 297, 309 n.
Gray, Robert, I, 53
Gray, Thomas, I, 61, 191, 394 n., II, 340
Great Britain, the sonnets in, II, 326-367
greeting with his gust, I, 289 f.
Greek Anthology, the, sonnets related to, I, 391-397, II, 131, 144, 164, 414; Sh.'s Greek parallels, II, 131; Greek translations of the sonnets, I, 255, II, 399
green, another's, I, 179 f.
Green, Henry, I, 150, 172
Green, Jane, I, 151
Green, Julian, II, 184
Greene, J. R., II, 358
Greene, Robert, I, 59, 93, 117, 271, 314, 334, 343, II, 255, 258, 261; the author of *Edward III*, I, 235, 364; the familiar ghost, II, 277; the rival poet, II, 282
Greenhill, James, II, 314-318, 320, 323
Greenlaw, Edwin, II, 121
Greenwood, George, Sir, I, 392, II, 42, 265
Greg, W. W., I, 82, II, 16
Gregg, —, Dr., II, 214 n.
Gregor, Joseph, I, 119, 175, 389, II, 149, 206, 239, 266
Grenville, Richard, Sir, II, 289
Grenzfragen des Nerven- und Seelenlebens, II, 235
Greville, Fulke, first Baron Brooke, I, 388; role of, in Q, II, 178, 273
Grey, Arthur, fourteenth Baron Grey de Wilton, I, 76
Griffin, Bartholomew, I, 79, 179, 245; part-author of Q, II, 47, and the rival poet, II, 292

- Griffin, W. H., I, 291, 369, II, 80, 253
 Grillparzer, Franz, II, 233, 250, 383 f.
 grind, my appetite, I, 275, II, 426
 Grisel, Jean, I, 394
 Griswold, A. W., II, 2
 groan, make love, I, 336 f.
 Groos, Karl, I, 96
 Grosart, A. B., I, 23, 66, 82, 204, 257, 261, 280, 345 f., II, 227, 267 f., 283 f., 289, 345; *Willobie*, II, 295 n., 299 n., 301 ff.
 Gross, Edgar, II, 384
 Groth, Ernst, I, 175, II, 105, 141, 210, 219, 237 f., 387
 Groto, Luigi, I, 394
 grounded on sinful loving, I, 363 f.
 grow'st to, I, 50 f.
Grub-Street Journal, II, 334
 Gruter, Jan, I, 394
 Gryffin, Edward, II, 218
 Gryffin, Margaret (Mrs. W. Hall), II, 218
 Gryffyn, Margery, II, 218
 guard (=guard-room), I, 340
 Guarini, G. B., I, 7, 15
 Guazzo, Stefano, I, 184, II, 326 n.
 Guégan, Bertrand, I, 13
 Günther, H. F. K., I, 6
 Guilpin, Edward, II, 122
 guilt, Sh.'s bewailed, I, 103 f. *See* disgrace
 Guiney, Louise I., I, 374 f., 377
 Guizot, F.-P.-G., II, 388 ff.
 Gullan, Marjorie, II, 376 n.
 gulls him with intelligence, I, 217 f.
 Gundolf (formerly Gundelfinger), Friedrich, I, 59, II, 236, 385, 388, 415 ff.
 Gunpowder Plot, I, 313
 gust, greeing with his, I, 289 f.
 Guthmann, A., II, 258 n.
 Guttman, Otto, II, 385
 Györy, Vilmos, II, 397
- H., A., II, 289 n.
 H., W., Master, the begetter, discussed, II, 166-241; initials, how pronounced, II, 232; part-author of Q, II, 48 f., 173 n.; other references to, I, 7, 56, 61, 266, 345, II, 3, 22, 29, 78, 85, 92, 94, 99, 133, 145, 160, 279, 302 f., 358
 H., Will, hires Sh. to write Q, II, 160, 222
- H., William, unknown author of Q, II, 224
 Haberl, Meinrad, II, 69 n., 387
 habit, love's best, I, 353, 355
 Hadow, W. H., Sir, I, 70, 249, II, 59, 150, 204
 Häfker, Hermann, II, 163 f., 215, 385
 Haines, C. M., II, 378, 388, 392
 Haines, C. R., I, 257, II, 182, 238 n., 310
 hair, false, Sh. attacks wearing, I, 177-180; marjoram buds and, I, 244, 247
 hairs be wires (*q. v.*), I, 333 ff.
 Hakluyt, Richard, I, 295
 Hales, J. W., I, 185
 Hall, A., I, 320, II, 169, 187, 199, 261, 277
 Hall, H. T., II, 361 n.
 Hall, Joseph, Bishop, II, 301
 Hall, S. C., I, 106, II, 358
 Hall, Susanna, Mrs., Sh.'s daughter, II, 219, 257, 259, 266
 Hall, William, the "begetter," II, 10, 171 ff., 176, 208, 215, 230; discussed, II, 216-219; his wife, Margaret, II, 218
 Hallam, Henry, II, 77, 142, 167, 196, 359-366, 393, 398, 415
 Halliwell-Phillipps, J. O., I, 23, II, 22, 125 n., 140, 144 f., 169
 hallowed, I, thy name, I, 271 f., II, 216
 Hamer, Enid, II, 421 f.
 Hamilton, Anne, I, 87
Hamlet, I, 33, 58 f., 79, 90 f., 106, 114, 145, 150, 174 f., 190, 192, 221, 225, 246, 266, 268, 275 ff., 282, 286, 299, 306 f., 321, 330, 373, 375, II, 39 n., 45, 50, 59, 130, 153, 159, 170, 173, 216, 223, 251, 265, 272, 276, 291, 365, 367, 374, 376, 378, 393, 401, 411, 415, 423, 433; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64, 66, 68-71, 73; Pembroke its hero, II, 202 f.; referred to, in the sonnets, II, 159
 Hammond, William, as Mr. W. H., II, 222 f.
 Hamnet, Susannah, Sh.'s sweetheart, II, 214
 Hampton Roads, Virginia, II, 187
 hand, uprear my, I, 134 f.; the white, conceit of, I, 246 f.
Handful of Pleasant Delights, I, 226
 hands of falsehood, I, 132

- handwriting, printer's errors caused
by, I, 47, 58 f., 77, 131, 153, 166,
173, 178, 181, 215, 288, 322, 348,
II, 8, 17, 216. *See* manuscript of Q;
misprints
- Hanmer, Thomas, Sir, II, 331 f.
- Hansen, Adolf, II, 396
- Hansen, Wilhelm, II, 316
- happies (verb), I, 19 f.
- Haraszti, Zoltán, II, 397
- Harbage, Alfred, II, 270
- Harbert, William: *see* Herbert
- Harco, Dydimus, II, 297
- Hardman, David, II, 313
- Harington, John, I, 261
- Harington, John, Sir, I, 71, 261
- Hariot, Thomas, as T. T., II, 229
- Harleian Society, II, 225 n.
- harmful deeds, I, 279, 281
- Harness, William, I, 106
- Harris, Frank, I, 55 f., II, 106, 147,
204, 265 f., 266 n.
- Harrison, G. B., I, 49, 76, 126, 166,
264 f., 267, 269, 312, 374, 378, II,
11, 14 n., 17 n., 60, 191, 271 f., 288,
295 n., 299 n., 310 f., 313, 326, 427
- Harrison, J. S., I, 259
- Harrison, W. A., I, 38, II, 198, 209,
262 f., 314
- Harrison, William, the friend, II, 228
- Harrower, John, II, 399
- harsh, featureless; and rude, I, 30 f.
- Hart, H. C., I, 57, 130, 247, 256
- Hart, J. C., II, 372
- Hart, J. S., II, 86, 240, 247, 256 f., 372
- Hart, Joan, Sh.'s sister, II, 181
- Hart(e), William, Sh.'s nephew, II,
179, 181, 186
- Hartmann, Erich, I, 60, 189, 204, 245
- Harvard University, Sh. study in, II,
368 f., 374 ff.
- harvest home festivities, I, 33
- Harvey, Gabriel, II, 267 f., 283, 290,
306 n.; the rival poet, II, 268, 277,
289; sonnets to, II, 178
- Harvey, William, Sir: *see* Hervey
- has* vs. *hath*, Sh.'s use of, II, 68
- Haslewood, Joseph, II, 301
- Hasselkuss, H. K., II, 127
- hate, away she threw, I, 372 f.
- hath* vs. *has*, Sh.'s use of, II, 68
- Hathaway, Richard, II, 213
- Hathaway, William, Jr., the begetter
and friend, II, 213 f., 226
- Hathaway, William, Sr., the begetter,
II, 213 f.
- Hathway, Richard, the begetter, II,
213
- Hatton, Elizabeth, Lady, II, 210, 274
- Hauer, Karl, II, 105 f., 385, 387
- Haughton, William, I, 367; as Mr.
W. H., II, 223
- Hauser, Otto, I, 273, II, 385
- Hausmann, Conrad, II, 385
- Havens, R. D., II, 331, 339, 347
- Hawes, Stephen, I, 361
- hawking, metaphor from, I, 202
- Hay, H. H., II, 267 n.
- Hayes, Helen, II, 377
- Hayes, Will: *see* Hewes
- Haynes, E. S. P., II, 238
- Hazlitt, William, the elder, II, 345,
350 f., 356
- Hazlitt, William, the younger, I, 12,
17, 21, 51, 59, 79, 88, 102, 135, 137,
168, 184, 211, 249, 261, 308, 317,
352, II, 54, 138, 167, 351
- Hazlitt, William Carew, I, 10 f., 17,
65 f., 116, 120, 261, 263, 268, 281,
II, 1, 43, 123, 174, 201 n., 203,
222 f., 263 n., 291 f., 299 n., 301 f.,
305, 351, 364 f.
- he (=it), I, 124
- Healey, John, II, 200
- Hearne, Thomas, I, 267, II, 182
- hearsay, like of, I, 60, 62
- heart, delivers to the, I, 286 f.; eye
and, the war of, I, 127-129, ended,
I, 130 f.; one foolish heart, I, 360 ff.
- heart-inflaming brand, I, 396
- heaven, next my, I, 275, 278; shun
the, I, 329, 332, II, 422
- heaven's air, I, 60
- heavy, how, do I journey, I, 136;
heavy ignorance, I, 201 f., II, 281,
290; heavy Saturn, I, 241 f., II, 330
- Hebler, Carl, II, 140, 187
- Hedger, E., I, 214
- Hegedüs, Stephan von, I, 393 f.
- height, a star's, I, 293, 295
- Heine, Heinrich, II, 137, 382, 404
- heir, beauty's successive, I, 323 f.
- Helen of Troy, I, 142, 325
- heles (=covers), I, 99
- hell, black as, I, 379 f., II, 219 n., 265;
foul as, I, 300; a hell of time, I,
302 f.; one angel in another's, I,

- 368, 371, II, 55; waiting so be, I, 156 f.
- Hell, Theodor: see *Penelope*
- Hell, William, the begetter, II, 219 n.
- Heming, John, II, 195 f., 201, 211
- Hemingway, S. B., II, 183 f.
- hence, from, I, 206 f.
- Henderson, George, II, 340, 347
- Henderson, W. A., II, 224
- hendiadys, I, 163, 240, 249, 321
- Heneage, Thomas, Sir, II, 193, 210, 219, 221
- Henry IV, king of France, I, 264
- Henry IV, Part I*, I, 96, 140 f., 170, 182, 268, 295 f.; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64, 66
- Henry IV, Part II*, I, 59, 108, 137, 170, 186, 252, II, 5; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64, 66
- Henry V*, I, 123 f., 373, II, 223; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64
- Henry V, as Prince Hal, the friend, II, 226
- Henry VI, Part I*, I, 117, 138, 245, 380, 385, II, 282; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64
- Henry VI, Part II*, I, 88; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64
- Henry VI, Part III*, I, 306, 348, 356; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64
- Henry VIII*, I, 73, 294, 305, II, 223; parallels with the sonnets, II, 65
- Henry VIII, king of England, II, 209
- Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales, the friend (Raleigh's), II, 229, 273
- Henry, Fernand, I, 196, 320, II, 8 n., 146, 170, 190, 218, 391
- Hense, C. C., I, 60, 333, 349, 379, 393, II, 124
- Henslowe, Philip, I, 281
- Hentzner, Paul, I, 33
- herald, only, to the spring, I, 9, II, 211
- heraldry, terms of, in *Q*, I, 107
- Heraud, J. A., II, 157, 272
- Herbert, Beatrix Lambton, Countess of Pembroke, I, 207
- Herbert, Edward, Sir, II, 227
- Herbert, Henry, second Earl of Pembroke, II, 205 f., 209, 212
- Herbert, Mary, II, 209
- Herbert, Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke, I, 110, II, 197, 199, 205, 207, 209 n., 210, 212, 268; Sh.'s patron, II, 291
- Herbert, Mary Talbot, Countess of Pembroke, II, 57, 210
- Herbert, Philip, fourth Earl of Pembroke, I, 7, II, 209; Sh.'s patron, II, 195 f., 201, 205 f., 211
- Herbert, William, first Earl of Pembroke, II, 227
- Herbert (Harbert), William, of Red Castle, first Baron Powis, the friend, II, 227
- Herbert (Harbert), William, poet, II, 227
- Herbert, William, third Earl of Pembroke, as Sh.'s friend, discussed, II, 195-213 (cf. 166-176); Bacon writes *Q* for, II, 164; beauty and ugliness of, II, 192, 195 f., 201 f., 204, 207; biographical details of, II, 57, 209-212; birthday sonnet to, II, 60, 212; Chapman and, II, 284 f., 287, 291; Coleridge on, II, 136; collects the sonnets, II, 46, 171; Daniel and, I, 199, II, 117, 207, 279 f., 373; dark-woman sonnets, hero of the, II, 83, 246; Davison and, II, 202, 284; edits the First Folio (*q. v.*), II, 274; first meets Sh., II, 59; homosexuality of, I, 55 f., II, 232-239; identified as Hamlet, II, 202, as "Hews," II, 185, as Sextus Pompeius, II, 87; Jonson and, II, 197 f., 283; mentioned, I, 7, 176, 201, 255, II, 54, 135 f., 140, 144, 157, 358, *et passim*; mistress, his, Lady Devonshire, II, 92, 261, Lady Rich, II, 89 f., 140, 260, and Mary Fitton (*q. v.*); part-author of *Q*, II, 47, 92, 198, 261; patron of Sh., II, 195 f.; *Poems*, I, 334; portrait of, verses on a, I, 207, II, 203; references, supposed, to, I, 159, 345; rival poet, the, and, II, 278, *et passim*; sonnets composed for, II, 90, 121, 246, or addressed to, II, 92, 178; Southampton his brother, II, 208 n., appears with, in *Q*, II, 83, 88 f., 171, 206 ff., and dedicates *Q* to him, II, 168, 175, 207
- Herder, J. G. von, II, 380
- heretic, policy that, I, 311, 313 (cf. II, 9 n., 181, 185)
- Herford, C. H., I, 28, 31, 46, 70, 93, 107, 166, 193, 214, 284, 374, 378, II, 71, 81, 154, 305, 310, 377

- hermaphrodite, the friend a, II, 222
 hermetic compositions, the sonnets
 as, I, 364, II, 157, 374
 Herrick, Robert, I, 161, II, 20, 23
 Herrmann, Burkhard ("Peter Al-
 vor"), II, 45, 165
 Hertzberg, Wilhelm, I, 392 f.
 Hervey (Harvey), William, Sir, as
 Mr. W. H., II, 49, 111, 174 f.; dis-
 cussed, 219 ff.
 Hessen, Robert, I, 38, II, 71, 146, 203,
 207, 218, 223, 242, 285
 heterosexuality, Sh.'s, I, 57
 Heubner, O. L., II, 383
 Hewes (Howes, Hayes), Will, Essex's
 musician, II, 181-184. *See* Hughes
Hews, I, 54, 58 f.; its meaning, II,
 181, 185, 197, 203, 224. *See* hues;
 Hughes (William)
 hexameton, II, 297, 303, 308
 Heywood, Thomas, II, 11, 20 f., 27 f.,
 33 n., 39, 332 ff.
 hide (=refuse to show), I, 363, 365
 hideous night, I, 32 f.; hideous winter,
 I, 17 f.
 high, on (=aloud), I, 201
 Hilbish, Florence M. A., II, 339 n.
 Hill, Aaron, II, 333
 Hill, C. J., I, 9, 31, 33, 49, 59, 61 f.,
 67, 71, 73, 85, 87, 97, 104, 107, 109,
 122, 124 f., *et passim*, II, 18 n.
 Hill, F. E., II, 213
 Hill, G. B., II, 339
 Hillard, Kate, II, 197, 283, 375
 him (=one), I, 273 f.
 Hinkle, G. H., II, 26 n., 27 f.
 Hinman, Charlton, II, 194
 his (=its), I, 26 f., 72, 130, 141, 213
 Hitchcock, E. A., Major General, I,
 364, II, 157, 160, 374
 Hitler, Adolf, I, 175
 Hoar, Robert, II, 316
 Hoby, Thomas, Sir, II, 131
 hog-faced gentlewoman, II, 56 n.
 Holbein, Hans, the younger, I, 71 f.
Holborn Drollery, II, 23 n.
Holborn Review, II, 236
 hold me nothing, I, 349 f.
Holden's Dollar Magazine, II, 372
 holds her in chase, I, 366 f.
 Holgate, John, II, 225
 Holgate, William, the friend, I, 260,
 II, 225 f.
 Holinshed, Raphael, II, 228
 Holland, the sonnets in, II, 395. *See*
 Dutch; Netherlands
 Holland, C., II, 320
 Holland, Hugh, I, 45
 Holme, Edward, II, 195
 Holme, William, II, 217
 Holmes, Elizabeth, I, 160
 Holmes, O. W., Justice, II, 154
 home life, Sh.'s, described in Q, II,
 161
 Homer, II, 278, 288; Chapman's, II,
 284-288; sonnet dedication to, II,
 106
 L'Hommedé, Edmond, I, 314, II, 106,
 223, 252, 261, 282, 391
 homosexuality, Bacon's, II, 235, 237
 n.; Sh.'s, discussed, II, 232-239,
 and referred to, I, 55-58, 294, 304,
 369, 388, II, 25, 141, 160, 293, 364,
 367, 391
 honey breath, I, 172 f.
 hope, catch thy, I, 366 f.; times in,
 I, 160, 162; hope of orphans, I,
 239 f.
 Hope, Constance, II, 228, 272, 289
 Hopkins, —, American publisher,
 II, 36 n.
 Hopkinson, Joseph, II, 40, 367
 Horace, I, 30, 51, 111, 140, 147 ff.,
 170, 227, 334, 373, 379, II, 131, 288
 Horn, C. E., II, 315, 317 ff., 321 f.
 Horn, Franz, I, 105 f.
 Horn, Wilhelm, I, 46
 Horne, Andrew, II, 184
 Hornstein, Lillian H., I, 375 f.
 horse (plural), I, 227
 Horsey, Edith, Lady, II, 299
 Hosmer, H. L., II, 163, 174, 274
 Hotson, J. L., II, 175, 194, 206, 299 f.
 n., 312, 327
 hour, world-without-end, I, 154 f.
 hours (dissyllable), I, 17; holy an-
 tique hours, I, 179 f.; idle hours in
 me, I, 163
 house (=family), I, 35, 38
 Housman, R. F., I, 41, 83, 147, 241,
 252, 257, 273, 279, 293, II, 342 f.,
 346 f., 357
How a Man May Choose a Good Wife,
 I, 125 f.
 Howard, Charles, first Earl of Not-
 tingham, lord high admiral, I, 261,
 II, 210
 Howard, E. J., II, 17 n.

- Howard, Henry, Earl of Surrey, I, 61, 194, 330, II, 118, 132, 209, 335, 412, 414, 417. See *Tottel's*
- Howard, Philip, first Earl of Arundel, II, 216 n.
- Howe, P. P., II, 350
- Howell, Thomas, I, 82
- Howes, William: see Hewes
- Hubbard, J. M., II, 368
- Huch, Friedrich, II, 385
- Hudson, H. N., I, 102, 227, 241, 284, 338, 376, II, 1, 6, 71, 74, 86, 139, 167, 181, 197, 247, 256 f., 371 ff.
- hue (=beauty), I, 208 f.; a man in, I, 54, 58 f., II, 181, 184 f., 197, 203; your sweet, I, 255 f.
- Hue and Cry, the, New Forest, I, 58
- hues, all, in his controlling, I, 54, 58 f., II, 7, 9 n., 181, 184 f., 197, 229
- hugely politic, I, 311, 313
- Hugh (=Welshman), II, 197
- Hughes, Charles, II, 295 n., 299 n., 302 n., 306 f., 310
- Hughes, John, II, 331
- Hughes, Margaret, actress, II, 182 n.
- Hughes, Thomas, mathematician, II, 183
- Hughes (Hewes), William, the friend, II, 57, 179, 186, 219, 278, 293, 304 n.; discussed, II, 180-185
- Hughes, William, of Gray's Inn, the friend, II, 184
- Hughes, William, Queen Elizabeth's son, by Oxford, the friend, II, 165, 184, 230
- Hughes, William, sea-cook, the friend, II, 182 ff., 221, 226, 364
- Hughes, William, supposed actor, the friend, II, 182 n., 183 f., 234, 304 n.
- Hughey, Ruth, I, 261, II, 182, 226
- Hugo, F.-V., II, 142, 170 n., 281 n., 390, 394; rearranges the sonnets, I, 192, II, 80, 86 f., 92
- Hugo, Victor, I, 280, II, 244 n., 391
- Hulett, James, II, 31 n.
- humble salve, I, 302 f.
- humility, Sh.'s conventional, I, 46 ff., 93, II, 128, 200, 204, 240. See boastfulness; modesty
- humor (=caprice), I, 229
- humors, the four, I, 227, 242, II, 129
- Humphreys, David, Colonel, II, 367
- hunch-back, Sh. a, I, 106
- Hungarian Quarterly*, II, 397
- Hungary, the sonnets in, II, 397
- Hunnis, William, as Mr. W. H., II, 220
- Hunt, F. C., II, 228
- Hunt, Leigh, I, 326, II, 362
- Hunt, T. W., II, 365 f.
- Hunter, Joseph, II, 195 ff.
- Hunterian Club, I, 61, 370
- Huntington, Henry E., II, 2, 5
- husbandry (=marriage), I, 35, 38
- hush the night, I, 252 f., II, 330
- Hussey, Richard, I, 170 f.
- huswife, I, 366 f.
- Hutchieson, J. C., II, 363 n.
- Hutchings and Romer, II, 316, 323
- Hutchinson, John, II, 229, 272
- Huth, Henry, II, 2
- Hutton, Edward, I, 276
- Hutton, James, I, 392-396, II, 332 n.
- Hyde, Edward, first Earl of Clarendon, II, 209
- hymn (=poem), I, 214, 216, II, 280, 283, 286 f., 290
- hyphenation, Sh.'s, I, 21, 57, 72
- I am that I am, I, 304, 306; upon deceased I, I, 187
- idle hours, I, 163; idle rank, I, 307
- idly (=unprofitably), I, 248
- idolatry, my love not, I, 257 f., II, 158 f.
- if (=to see if), I, 249
- ignorance, heavy, I, 201 f., II, 281
- ill, preserve the, I, 379
- illegitimate children, Sh.'s, II, 224, 237 f., 265
- illnesses, Sh.'s, I, 189, 395. See masochism; paralytic; syphilis
- ills, gain by, I, 300 f.
- ill-wresting world, I, 358
- imagery and images, Sh.'s, notes on, I, 8 f., 13, 15, 21, 32, 42, 64, 72, 95 f., 152 f., 160 f., 189 f., 205, 217 f., 233, 238, 240, 256, 274, 281, 283 f., 301, 312, 326, 366 f., 371, II, 66, 110, 117 f., 130, 362, 364, 400, 402, 410, 423-428, 434, *et passim*. See comparisons; conceits
- imaginary sight, my soul's, I, 78 f.
- immorality, Sh.'s, I, 276 f., 280, 306, 330 f., 342, 345 ff., 354, 360, 363 f., 367, 369 ff., 387 ff., II, 133, 135 f., 138 ff., 142 ff., 146, 148 f., 188, 224, 252, 255, 348, 360 ff., 365, 372, 377.

- 398, *et passim*. See bewailed; dipso-maniac; disgrace; homosexuality; morality; murderer; obscenity; syphilis
- immortality, self-claims to, conventional, I, 43, 51, 147-151, 162, 206, 251, II, 122, 167-173, 179, *et passim*. See boastfulness; conventions; humility
- impediments, admit, I, 293 f.
- imperfect shade, fair, I, 121 f.
- import forgetfulness, I, 307 f.
- importune (accent), I, 363 f.
- imprints, different, of Q, II, 1 f.
- imprisoned absence, I, 156 f.; imprisoned pride, I, 140 f.
- in hope, time's, I, 160, 162
- incapable (=unable to receive), I, 286 f.
- incense, I bring, I, 100, 102
- incertainties, I, 263, II, 426
- incertainty, certain o'er, I, 291 f.
- incest, Q a story of, II, 276
- India, the sonnets in, II, 399
- indigest, things, I, 289
- indirectly seek, I, 177 f.
- infection, live with, I, 177
- infinitive, active, passive use of, I, 331
- influence (=inspiration), I, 201 f.; the stars in influence comment, I, 41 f.
- informer, suborned, I, 315, 317 f., II, 7, 9 n., 265, 274
- Ingleby, C. M., I, 68, 106, 118, 376, II, 169, 216, 302 ff.
- Ingpen, Roger, I, 279, 281, II, 351
- inhearse, my thoughts, I, 217 f.
- inheritors of this excess, I, 374, 378
- iniquity, self-loving were, I, 165 f.
- initial words, repetition (*q. v.*) of, I, 174
- injury (=insult), I, 156 f.
- ink or lines, black, I, 167, 172, II, 275
- inspirer, *begetter* meaning, discussed, II, 166-176
- instinct, I, 16, 136
- insufficiency, with, to sway, I, 385, II, 422
- insults o'er, I, 263, 270
- intelligence, gulls him with, I, 217 f.
- intend (=set out upon), I, 78 f.
- interest (=share), I, 192; interest of the dead, I, 90 f.
- interim, this sad, I, 152, II, 181, 185
- interjections, Sh.'s fondness for, I, 29
- International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, II, 266
- Internationale Monatsschrift*, I, 269, 280, 314, II, 65, 147, 187, 189, 205, 267
- interpretations, general, of Q, II, 213 ff., 228, 234, 245 ff. See abstractions
- invention, give, light, I, 109; invention in a noted weed, I, 196 f.; laboring for invention, I, 158 f.
- Ireland, Essex's war in, I, 73, 267, II, 57, 187, 194
- Ireland, W. H., II, 249
- Irish Monthly*, II, 343
- irregular sonnets, I, 244 f., 319 f., 372, II, 26 n., 46, 129, 154, 339, 345 ff., 351, 368, 431; others originally, I, 8, 12, II, 185
- Irving, Henry, Sir, I, 276
- Isaac, Hermann: see Conrad
- Isis*, I, 73
- Italian, the dark woman an, II, 267, 272; Italian sonneteers, conventions of the, in Sh., II, 62, 241, 250, 254 f., 292, 411; Sh.'s knowledge of Italian, I, 359, II, 127. See Italy; Petrarch
- italics in Q, significance of, I, 7, II, 7 f., 16, 99, 125, 181
- Italy, Sh.'s travels in, I, 95, 123, 136, 170, 395, II, 267; the sonnets in, II, 392 ff. See Baiae; Caracciolo; Italian
- Izard, T. C., I, 84
- J., W. C., II, 188
- J., Y., II, 53, 134, 244, 353
- jacks of the virginals, I, 326 f., II, 269 n.
- jade (=horse), I, 137, 139, II, 188
- Jaggard, Isaac, II, 19
- Jaggard, William, Captain, II, 2 f. n., 29, 30 n., 32, 361
- Jaggard, William, printer, I, 354, II, 20 n., 27, 43, 53, 74
- Jahrbuch, Sh.*, I, 6, 8, 11, 15, 20, 28, 47, 63 f., 66, 78, 93, 96, 109, 121, 167, 170, 173, 194, 213, 220, 235, 264 f., 268, 275, 280, 298, 304, 311, 317, 323, 330, 334, 338, 356, 375, 377, 392-395, II, 9 n., 10 f., 46, 50, 56, 62 f., 65 f., 70, 72, 86, 92, 93 n.,

- 98 n., 104 n., 105, 108, 118, 121, 123 f., 128 f., 131 f., 134 n., 138, 143 f., 150, 155, 159 n., 162, 167, 187 f., 197 ff., 208, 214 f., 220, 221 n., 223, 233, 238, 242, 248, 254, 258 n., 260 f., 262 n., 264, 267, 269 f., 271 n., 282 f., 308, 381, 384, 396, 428
 jail, rigor in my, I, 340 f.
 James I, king of England, I, 266 f., II, 57, 71, 122, 164, 201, 209 n., 236
 James I, king of Scotland, I, 334
 James, George, II, 164
 James, P. R., I, 395
 Jameson, Anna, II, 135 f., 140, 186, 244, 354
 Jameson, R. W., II, 44
 Jammes, Francis, II, 392
 Jamyn, Amadis, I, 124, II, 126, 253
 Japan, the sonnets in, II, 398
 jealous (spelling), I, 154 f., II, 5, 15
 jealousy, Sh. on, I, 231, 318
 Jeffery, Edward, II, 40
 Jensen, S. B., II, 396
 Jente, Richard, Sh.'s proverbs (*q. v.*), I, 101, 236, 380
 Jesuits, conspiracies of, I, 264, 313 f.; Q composed by, II, 45
 Jevons, W. S., II, 361
 jewels, Sh.'s, I, 108
 Jobert, J., II, 318
 Jodelle, Etienne, I, 131, 166, 324, 370, II, 126, 240, 253 f.
 Johannes, J. G., II, 221 n.
 John, Lisle C., II, 255
 Johnson, C. F., I, 281, II, 365
 Johnson, Harold, II, 45
 Johnson, Jesse, II, 44, 224, 283
 Johnson, Pamela H., II, 366 n.
 Johnson, Samuel, Dr., I, 352, 361, II, 31, 38, 331, 336, 338 f., 341 f., 347, 349 f., 369, 378, 428, 431, 433
 Johnson, Thomas, I, 282
 Jolley, Thomas, II, 2
 jollity, trimmed in, I, 174 f.
 Jonas, Maurice, II, 305 n.
 Jones, H. F., II, 234, 364
 Jones, R. F., II, 334
 Jones, W. A., II, 372
 Jones, William, II, 40, 337
 Jonson, Ben, I, 61, 67, 78 f., 82, 93, 249, 326 f., 330, II, 5 n., 19 f., 23, 44, 191, 195, 430, 433; alludes to Q, II, 197 f., 205; arranges with Bacon for the publication of Q, II, 44; attacks the sonnet, II, 326, 336; dedicates the first folio, II, 195; discusses Q, II, 160; the rival poet, II, 214, 277, 283 f., 293; sonnets to, II, 178
 Jonson, G. C. A., I, 57 f., II, 75
 Jordan, Thomas, I, 150
 Jordan, Wilhelm, I, 273, 304, 333, II, 71, 78, 188, 242 f., 272, 280, 383
 Jortin, John, I, 74, 173, 198, 298, II, 334
Journal of English and Germanic Philology, I, 87 f., 91, 156, II, 67, 98 n., 239, 270, 308
Journal of Speculative Philosophy, II, 143, 279, 370
 Jouve, P. J., I, 55
 Joyce, James, II, 184, 265, 366
 judgment's place, my, I, 336 f.
Julius Caesar, I, 64, 93, 124, 156, 223, 295, II, 398; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64
 Junes, three hot, I, 255
 Junius, R., II, 329
 Jusserand, J. J., I, 149, II, 179, 231, 234 f.
 Juvenal, I, 140, II, 131
 Kahn, L. W., II, 378, 388, 429
 Kannegiesser, K. F. L., II, 381
 Karpf, Carl, II, 58 n., 159, 169, 272
 Kasprowicz, Jan, II, 398
 Kastner, L. E., I, 79, 207, II, 327
 Kaun, Ernst, II, 127
 Keats, George, II, 77
 Keats, John, I, 33, 49, 169, 225, 334, II, 77, 351, 358, 366, 375, 409, 428
 Keightley, Thomas, I, 95
 Keller, Wolfgang, I, 67, 74, 78, 165, 173, 198, 227, 240, 248, 264, II, 48, 50, 59, 104 n., 173, 191, 215 f., 245, 252, 271 n., 285
 Kellner, Leon, I, 37, 45 f., 53, 100, 114, 172-175, 177 f., 191, 263, 267 f., 305, 314, 346 f., II, 25, 26 f. n., 106, 147, 155
 Kellogg, G. D., I, 381
 Kemble, J. P., II, 354
 Kemp, William, Fitton and, II, 262 f.; the friend, II, 225
 Kennedy, A. G., I, 377
 Kennedy, J. M., II, 142
 Kennicot, Benjamin, Mrs., II, 339

- Kenny, Thomas, II, 140, 179, 361 f.
 Kent, Sydney, I, 245, II, 71, 82
 Kenyon, J. S., I, 279, 282
 Ker, John, third Duke of Roxburghe, II, 2
 Ker, W. P., I, 83 f.
 Kern, A. A., II, 161 n.
 Kerr, B. C., II, 226
 Keser, Jean, I, 20, 46, 57, 71, 102, 178, 284, 314, 317
 key (pronunciation), I, 140
 key sonnet of Q, I, 369
 Keynes, Geoffrey, I, 8, 79, 264, II, 18 n.
 kindness, public, I, 103 f.
King John, I, 61, 70, 96, 134, 165, 199, 254, 268, 284, 334; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64, 66
King Lear, I, 166, 175, 254, 275, 277, 294, 301, 347, 371, II, 3 n., 153, 266, 326 n.; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64, 69
 King, Henry, Bishop, I, 337
 King, M. P., II, 322 f.
 kingly, most, drinks, I, 289 f.
 Kingsford, C. L., II, 205, 209 ff.
 Kingsley, Charles, I, 105
 "Kingsmill, Hugh": see Lunn
 Kinnear, B. G., I, 30, 44 f., 137, 165, 177, 181, 286, 293, 295, 319, 321, 323, 374
 Kirwood, A. E. M., II, 268 n.
 Kisfaludy Society, II, 397
 Kittredge, G. L., I, 70, 79, 91, 183, 281, 312, II, 11, 71, 110, 156, 177 f., 206, 213, 232, 252 f., 266, 288, 375
 Klášterský, Ant., II, 398
 Klein, David, I, 63, 69, II, 254
 Kliem, Hans, I, 369, II, 124, 235
 Kloos, Willem, II, 395
 Knapp, A. M., II, 39 n.
 Knecht, Jacob, I, 236
Knickerbocker, I, 223, II, 371
 knife, age's cruel, I, 167 f., 193; conquest of a wretch's, I, 192 f. (cf. II, 44)
 Knight, Charles, I, 6, 24 f., 146 f., 161, 278, 283, 317, II, 6, 137, 167, 179, 196, 230, 247, 256 f., 360; rearranges Q, II, 74, 85 ff., 111
 Knight, G. W., II, 236
 Knight, John, II, 376 n.
 Knights, L. C., I, 264, 277, II, 43, 71, 108, 155, 278, 425 ff.
 Knollys, William, Sir, I, 345
 Knortz, Karl, II, 374
 known injury, hate's, I, 113, 115
 Koch, Max, II, 143, 233 f.
 Kock, E. A., I, 86 f.
 König, Wilhelm, I, 268, 275, 280, 330 f., II, 129
 Körting, G. K. O., II, 143
 Kok, A. S., II, 395
 Konkle, B. A., II, 40
 Koszul, André, II, 391
 Kralik, Richard von, I, 123, 395, II, 59, 82, 216, 269
 Kraus, Karl, II, 385
 Krauss, Fritz, I, 14, 64, 78, 109, 213, 298, 323, 330, 334, 338, 356 f., 375, 392, II, 46, 63, 120 f., 140 f., 198, 207, 233, 260, 385 f.; rearranges Q, II, 90
Kreatur, I, 159, II, 237
 Kreyssig, Friedrich, I, 55, 149, II, 141 f., 188, 214 f., 244, 250, 384
 Kühne, F. G., II, 137, 249 f., 401
Kultur, I, 123, 395, II, 59, 82, 216, 269
Kunst, II, 250, 258
 Kyd, Thomas, the rival poet, II, 282

 L., C. C., II, 374
 L., R., I, 62, 319
 lace itself, I, 177, II, 428
 Lachmann, Karl, I, 273, II, 381 f.
 lady in scarlet and white, the dark woman, II, 267 n.
 Lafond, Ernest, II, 139, 390
 Lamb, Charles, I, 261, 275, II, 345
 lameness, Marlowe's, II, 282; Raleigh's, II, 44; Sh.'s, I, 105 ff., 223 f., II, 148; Watson's, II, 51; Will H.'s, II, 160
 Lamson, Roy, Jr., II, 314
 Landau, E., II, 207, 237 n., 274
 Landauer, Gustav, I, 113, 231 f., II, 71, 83, 148, 173, 191, 231, 258 n., 411 f.
 Landor, W. S., II, 76, 341, 345, 353 f., 358
 Langbaine, Gerard, II, 256, 314, 330
 Lanier, Sidney, II, 142, 375
 Lanz, Henry, I, 7, 216
 lap, proud, their, I, 241 f.
 Larbaud, Valery, I, 263, 277, II, 71, 232, 234, 293 n., 391
 lark, I, 83, 85
 Laroche, Benjamin, II, 390

- lascivious grace, I, 113, 115, 117
 latch (=catch), I, 287
 Latham, Henry, I, 144
 Latin Anthology, sonnets related to the, I, 391-397; Latin translations of the sonnets, I, 50, 138 f., 144, 376, 381, II, 399; Sh.'s Latin sources, II, 131 f.
 Laubmann, G. von, II, 382
 laughed and leaped, Saturn, I, 241 f., II, 330
 Laughton, L. G. C., I, 205
 law, Sh. and the, I, 87, 134 f., 163, 192, 215, 219, 269, 297, 317, 342, 364, 378. *See* Campbell (John); Clarkon; Davis (C. K.); White (E. J.)
 Law, R. A., I, 50
 Lawes, Henry, I, 293, II, 21 n., 211, 314, 323 f.
 Lawrence, B. E., I, 263
 lay (=put colors on), I, 250 f.
 Lea, Kathleen M., I, 335
 Leamer, Thomas, II, 395
 lean penury, I, 212, II, 284
 learned's wing, I, 201 f., II, 277, 281, 289
 lease (=allotted time), I, 50 f.; lease of my true love, I, 263, 269
 Le Duchat, L.-F., I, 394
 Lee, Nathaniel, I, 376
 Lee, Sidney, Sir, I, 6 ff., 15, 18, 22, 27, 29, 37, 42, 47, 49, 51 ff., 58, 60 f., 63, 67, *et passim*, II, 1-6, 8 f. n., 9, 11-17, 19, 24-27, 29 n., 40, 49, 54 f., 58, 65 f., 74, 94, 177, 182, 193 f., 197, 200 f., 209, 215 n., 270, 285, 290, 304 f., 309, 326 n., 327 f., 408; calls Q autobiographical, II, 144, then literary (*q. v.*) exercises, II, 145, 240 f., 253 f., and is therefor attacked, II, 146-151, and supported, II, 152-156; identifies the dark woman as Fitton, II, 190, 199, 262-265, and then as conventional, II, 240, 253 f.; identifies the friend as Pembroke, II, 144, 189, 199, 262, and then as Southampton, II, 144, 187 n., 190, 194, 199-203, 210 n., 211 f., 240, 264; on the begetter, or Hall, II, 166, 171-174, 179, 208, 216 ff.; on the sources, II, 117, 122-128, 130 ff.
 leese, I, 17 f.
 Lefranc, Abel, II, 165
 Legis, R. H., II, 159, 173, 280, 363
 Legouis, Emile, II, 71, 391 n.
 Lehmann, Liza, II, 322
 Leicester, Earl of: *see* Dudley (Robert)
 Leigh, G. A., II, 289 f.
 Leishman, J. B., I, 57
 Leitzmann, Albert, II, 381
 'lembics foul as hell, I, 300
 Lennox, Duke of: *see* Stuart
 Lentzner, K. A., II, 386
 Leo, F. A., II, 384 f.
 Leoni, Nestore, II, 394 n.
 Lepanto, battle of, I, 263
 Lespinasse, Julie de, II, 148 f.
 less, more and, of, I, 237
 Lessing, G. E., II, 380
 letters, the sonnets as, II, 253, 258; W.'s and R.'s, in Q, II, 50
 Lettsom, W. N., I, 59, 121, 165, 241, 300, 381
 level at my abuses, I, 304, 306; level of your frown, I, 296 f.
 Leveson, Richard, Sir, II, 262
 Levi, A. R., II, 144 n., 393
 Levy, Elizabeth, II, 385
 Levy, Oscar, II, 142
 Lewis, B. R., II, 312
 Lewy, Heinrich, II, 316, 318, 320, 324
 Leyris, Pierre, I, 55
 liberty (=licentiousness), I, 116 f.; imprisoned absence of your, I, 156 f.
 Library, I, 261, 264, 312 f., 316, II, 2 n., 5 n., 16, 18 n., 19, 29 n., 50, 60, 63 n., 170, 174, 192, 218, 268 n.
 Lichtenberger, Ernest, II, 170
 Liddell, M. H., I, 376, II, 329 n.
 lie, virtuous, some, I, 187
 light, main of, I, 160 f.
 light's flame, thy, I, 5, 8
 like as (conjunction), I, 160, 298 f.
 lilies that fester, I, 233 ff., II, 110, 329, 425 f.
 lily, I condemned the, I, 244, 246 f.
 limits far remote, from, I, 123 f.
 limping sway, by, I, 174, 176
 Lindner, Albert, II, 261
 line (=sonnet), I, 192; filled up his, I, 217 f.
 lines of life, I, 44 ff.; Sh.'s eternal, I, 50, and poor rude lines, I, 92 f.
 linger out (=protract), I, 225 f.

- links and echoes, sonnet, I, 19, 28, 32, 42, 44, 48, 67, 90, 103, 134, 158, 163, 165, 178, 180, 186, 189, 192, 194, 221, 227, 229, 250, 252, 302, 364, 366, II, 80 f., 83 f., 95 f., 109 f., 118. *See* arrangement; rime-links
- Lintott, Bernard, his edition of the sonnets, II, 26 n., 39 n., 133, 243 f., 333 f., described, II, 36 ff.
- Lippincott's Magazine*, I, 293, II, 197, 283, 375
- Literarische Echo*, Das, I, 56
- literary exercises, the sonnets as, II, 135, 152-156, 244, 253 ff., 290, 384, 407, 418, *et passim*. *See* conventions; Lee (Sidney)
- Literary World*, I, 320, II, 372
- Literatur*, II, 52 n., 387
- Literature*, I, 176, 345, II, 169, 218, 263 n.
- Littledale, H., I, 370
- Litton, María, the dark woman, II, 266 n.
- live remembered not to be, I, 12, 14
- lively heat, I, 391, 394
- livery, youth's proud, I, 10 f.
- loan, pay the willing, I, 19 f.
- Loane, G. G., I, 61, 161, 199, 258, 359
- Locker-Lampson, Frederick, II, 2, 5
- Lockhart, J. G., II, 134, 345
- Loder, E. J., II, 315, 319
- Lodge, Thomas, I, 88, 205, 319, 334, II, 117, 132, 431; the rival poet, II, 277
- Loewenberg, J., I, 169
- Lofft, Capell, II, 340
- Logeman, Henri, I, 325
- London and Westminster Review*, II, 136
- London Daily Telegraph*, II, 225
- London Mercury*, I, 50, 293, II, 103
- Long, Mason, II, 266
- Longfellow, H. W., II, 394
- Lonsdale, C., II, 315
- look as, I, 26; look strange, I, 223 f.; look what (=whatever), I, 26, 105, 108, 200; look whom (=whom-ever), I, 30 f. (This *look* usage is elaborately discussed by Mark Eccles [*q. v.*], *J. E. G. P.*, 1943, XLII, 386-400)
- looking-glass in a table-book, I, 198 f.
- looks, presagers of my breast, I, 65 ff.
- Looney, J. T., II, 174 f., 195, 275
- Lopez, Roderigo, I, 264
- lord of my love, I, 75, II, 163, 228
- Lord, Nellie, II, 338 n.
- Lord's Prayer, I, 272. *See* Bible
- loss, thy servant's, live upon, I, 374, 378
- lost sonnets, Sh.'s, I, 291, II, 54, 70, 84, 93, 111, 146
- Lougher, Captain, II, 262
- Lounsbury, T. R., II, 334
- love, conventions of, II, 233 ff., 389 (*see* conventions); definitions of, in verse, I, 330; love for love, I, 137, 139; love is a babe, I, 291 f.; sweet love, renew, I, 152
- love-kindling fire, I, 391, II, 422
- Lovell, Reeve, and Company, II, 2, 3 n., 5
- lovely boy, my, I, 319 f., II, 178, 186 f., 191, 226 n., 241, 329 (*see* boy); lovely knights, I, 260 f.; lovely youth, I, 144 f.
- lover (used of a man by a man), I, 90-93, II, 232 f., 379
- Lover's Complaint*, II, 428; as Sh.'s "passion," I, 58; Benson's, II, 20 f., 25, 27 f., and later editions, II, 40; composed, not by Sh., II, 42, 46, but by Chapman, II, 286, or the rival poet, II, 293 f.; date of, II, 60; grammar note on, I, 236; parallels with the sonnets, I, 14, 44, 91, 101, 237, 297, II, 65; popularity of, II, 327; referred to, in the Q dedication, II, 172; Steevens on, II, 338; text of, II, 4
- love's "ay," I, 381 f.; love's delight, sweet hours of, I, 103 f.
- Love's Labor's Lost*, I, 40, 52, 59, 62, 64, 120, 154, 156, 202, 209 f., 252, 273, 293, 324 f., 352, 376, 380, 397, II, 3 n., 93, 159, 169, 193, 249, 251 ff., 261, 267, 269, 288, 372; parallels with the sonnets, II, 63-66, 68-71, 159
- Love's Labor's Won*, II, 165, 327
- Low, Samuel, II, 368
- Lowell, Amy, II, 77 n.
- Lowell, J. R., I, 19, 65, 95, 100 f., 130 f., 138, 167, 172, 177, 221, 241, 291, 302, II, 373
- Lucan, II, 5
- Lucas, E. V., I, 275
- Lucas, F. L., I, 187

- Lucas, R. M., II, 313 n.
 Lucas, Stanley, and Weber, II, 315-321, 323
 Lucas, W. I., II, 378
 Luce, Morton, I, 351, 354, 375, II, 71, 82, 152, 172, 231, 247 f., 305, 338, 343 n., 365, 407 f.
Lucrece, II, 193, 201, 212, 223, 268, 279, 313 n., 329, 331, 333, 353, 360 f., 365 f., 369, 380, 383, 402, 408, 413; an attack on the dark woman, II, 269; borrows from Chaucer, II, 292; Coleridge on, II, 349; composed by "R.," II, 50; dedication of, II, 173, 211, repeated in the sonnets, I, 67, 75 f., II, 186, 189 f.; editions of, by Gildon, II, 29 f., Boston publishers, II, 35 f., Lintott, II, 36 ff., and others, II, 40, 336; grammar notes on, I, 26, 117, II, 68; imitated in *Edward III*, I, 234 f.; a lecture to Southampton, II, 188; Meres on, II, 53, 328; metrics, II, 67; Middleton imitates, II, 309; omitted by Benson, II, 20; parallels with the sonnets cited, I, 11, 13, 44, 51, 66, 70, 87, 99, 107, 112, 118, 128 f., 157, 163, 166, 174 f., 179, 187, 192, 218, 225, 252, 254, 284, 286, 302, 307, 321, 330, 332, 372 f., II, 59, 71 f., and discussed, II, 64-68; popularity of, II, 326 f., 348 f.; referred to, in Q, I, 67, 109, 315; sonnets developed from, I, 330, II, 154; the sonnets later than, II, 55, 187; Steevens on, II, 337 f.; text of, authorized by Sh., II, 3, 6, 8 n., 9, 23, 42, 384; Time in, I, 150; translations of, II, 378, 396, 398; *Willobie* and, II, 297, 304, 306 f., 310 ff.
 Lucretius, I, 13, 15, 218, II, 131
 Lucy Negro, the dark woman, II, 209, 272, 291
 Lucy, Thomas, Sir, II, 4 n.
 Ludwig, Albert, II, 143 n.
 Ludwig, Emil, II, 76, 385
 Lüdeke, Henry, II, 53, 85, 249 n., 380
 Lul, Raymond, I, 200
 Lunn, Hugh Kingsmill, II, 238 n.
 lust, the dark woman typifies, II, 160, 272; sonnet on lust, I, 329, II, 163 f., 421, 423, 428
 lusty days, thy, I, 10 f., lusty leaves, I, 17 f.
 lute, sonnet on playing the, I, 23
 Luttrell, Narcissus, II, 2
 Lydgate, John, I, 199, 334 f.
 Lygon, Frederick, Earl Beauchamp, II, 318
 Lyly, John, I, 70, 85, 101, 128, 191, 218, 234, 249, 256, 295, 306, II, 129; the rival poet, II, 290; Sh.'s borrowings from, II, 124 f.
 Lynch, Arthur, II, 192, 366
 M., H. E., I, 51
 M., J., I, 374, II, 7 n., 160, 215, 279
 Mabellini, Adolfo, II, 394
 Macaulay, G. C., I, 170 f.
Macbeth, I, 31, 61 f., 67, 101, 138, 237, II, 266, 426; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64
 McClumpha, C. F., I, 20, 47, 100, 102, 220, II, 66
 McClure, N. E., II, 212
 Macfarren, George, Mrs., II, 314
 McGrail, T. H., I, 207
 Machin, Lewis, II, 289
 Mackail, J. W., I, 54 f., 58, 77, 196, 215, 264, 266, 306, 327, 364, 391 f., II, 10, 50, 61, 68, 82, 155, 166, 173, 181, 219, 231, 251, 286, 293, 327 n., 420 f.
 Mackay, Charles, I, 225, II, 46 f., 92, 143, 145, 198, 207, 261 f., 283
 McKee, Brainerd, II, 259 n.
 Macken, John ("Ismael Fitzadam"), II, 343
 Mackenzie, A. C., Sir, II, 316 f., 319, 322
 Mackenzie, Agnes M., II, 148
 McKerrow, R. B., I, 94, II, 41, 130, 217, 295, 299 n.
 McKillop, A. D., II, 331
 McMahan, Anna B., II, 259
 MacMechan, Archibald, II, 137
Macmillan's Magazine, I, 7, 188, 198, 223, 234, 239, 276, II, 59, 78, 188, 288
 McNeal, T. H., I, 334
 MacPeck, J. A. S., I, 78, 87
 Macquoid, Percy, I, 141
 Macray, W. D., II, 191, 209
 mad ears, I, 358
 Madan, Bioren and, II, 39 f.
 madding fever, I, 300 f.

- Maecenas, I, 227
 März, II, 266, 385
Magazin für die Literatur des Aus-
landes, II, 141, 214, 384
 Magon, Leopold, II, 396
Magyar Sh.-Tár, II, 397
 maiden gardens, unset, I, 44
 main of light, I, 160 f.
 Main, D. M., I, 61, 88, 145, 168, 172,
 184, 196, 261, II, 173, 345
 Mair, G. H., II, 192
 makeless wife, I, 26
 Malden, H. E., II, 182
 Malkin, B. H., II, 348
 Malone, Edmond, I, 9, 11, 13 ff.,
 17 ff., 21, 24, 26 f., 31, 33 f., 37 f.,
 40, 42, 44 f., 47, 50 f., 55, 57 f., 61,
 64, 66 f., *et passim*, II, 2, 5, 26 n.,
 33, 37 n., 38 ff., 53, 75 f., 117 f., 133,
 166, 177, 179 ff., 232, 242, 248 f.,
 256, 278 f., 336 f., 348 f., 352 ff.,
 360, 366, 378, 380 f.
 Malone Society reprints, I, 14, II, 272
 Malsburg, E. F. G. O. von der, II, 381
 man, a, all, II, 247, or part of the
 sonnets addressed to, II, 177, 246,
 329 (*see* addressees; men; woman;
 women); a man right fair, I, 368,
 370, II, 239 n.
 manege, terms of, I, 227, 249
Manhattan, II, 42 n., 77
 Manibetter, Lady, the dark woman,
 II, 56, 267 n.
Manly Anniversary Studies, I, 330
 Mann, F. O., I, 14
 manners, in, I, 214; with manners
 (=decently), I, 111
 Manners, Elizabeth Sidney, Countess
 of Rutland, the dark woman, II, 274
 Manners, Roger, fifth Earl of Rut-
 land, *alias* Sh., II, 43 n., 45, 50 n.,
 165, 207, 229 n., 237 n., 274
 mansion (=body), I, 236
 Mant, Richard, II, 345
 manuscript of Q, supposed, I, 77, 238,
 246, II, 3, 6, 8 n., 9 ff., 16 ff., 27,
 49, 84, 93 f., 96, 99, 101 ff., 108 f.,
 119, 121 ff., 172, 192 f., 213, 217 f.,
 220 f., 293 f., 328, *et passim*; manu-
 script of Benson's edition, sup-
 posed, II, 25-28; manuscript anno-
 tations in Benson's edition, I, 55;
 manuscript versions of the sonnets,
 I, 8, 10, 23, 92, 145, 160, 173, 186,
 260 f., 263, 293, 354, II, 225, 243,
 327 ff., 394 n.
 MS. Additional 15226 (British Mu-
 seum), I, 23
 MS. Additional 28635 (British Mu-
 seum), I, 261
 MS. Drexel, New York Public Li-
 brary, I, 293, II, 323
 MS. Folger (Sangorski), II, 3 n.
 MS. Folger 267.1, I, 8, 160, 173, 263,
 II, 329
 MS. Folger 452.4, I, 92, 186
 MS. Folger 2071.7, I, 354
 MS. Harleian 293 (British Museum),
 II, 182
 MS. Holgate (Morgan M. A. 1058),
 I, 260, II, 225
 MS. Top. Oxon. e. 5 (Bodley), II, 182
 manuscripts, illuminated, Sh.'s refer-
 ence to, I, 159
 many's looks, in, I, 231
 Manzoni, Alessandro, I, 51
 map of days outworn, I, 179
 Marchi, Luigi de, II, 198, 245, 393
 marching song, the sonnets as, II, 437
 "Marcus," II, 249 n.
 Marcus, Henry, II, 397
 Marguerite de Valois, queen of Na-
 varre, II, 164
 Marianus Scholasticus, I, 392 ff.
 Marie, Aristide, II, 237
 marigold at the sun's eye, I, 73 f.
 Marino, Giambattista, II, 411
 Mariolatry, Sh. on, II, 157
 Maristany, Fernando, II, 396 f.
 marjoram, buds of, I, 244, 247
 mark, ever-fixed, I, 293 f.
 Markham, Gervase, I, 201, 267, II,
 194 n.; the rival poet, II, 277,
 289 ff.
 Marks, Josephine P. P., II, 266 n.
 Marlowe, Christopher, I, 27, 67, 153,
 184, 314, 327, 334, 350, 369, II,
 5 f., 62, 258, 267, 289, 334, 422;
 borrowings of, from Sh., II, 124,
 282 f.; Chapman and, II, 286;
 death of, referred to, I, 88, 193,
 and Q based on, II, 87; *Hero and*
Leander, written by Anne Whate-
 ley, II, 46; Hughes and, II, 184;
 part-author of Q, II, 47, 92, 283;
 a pederast, II, 236; the rival poet,
 I, 217, II, 58, 89, 188, 277, 281 ff.,
 289

- Marlowe, John, II, 184
 Marot, Clément, I, 113, II, 255
 Marquis, Don, I, 276
 marriage of true minds, I, 293 f., II, 421; sonnets advising marriage, I, 5-49, II, 119 ff., 161, 199, 220, 222 ff., 230, 235, 239, 249 (*see* procreation); sonnets on Sh.'s marriage, I, 391 (*see* Shakespeare, Anne)
 married to my muse, I, 208
 Mars his, I, 147, 150 f.
 Marschall, Wilhelm, I, 36, II, 17, 50, 105, 169, 292 f., 385
 Marshall, F. A., I, 275 f.
 Marshall, William, II, 19
 Marston, John, I, 93 f., II, 62; the rival poet, II, 277, 284, 293
 Marsus, Domitius, II, 132
 Martelli, Ludovico, II, 234
 Martial, I, 193, 395
 Martinez, E. J., II, 378, 397
 Marty-Laveaux, C. J., I, 124
 Marvell, Andrew, II, 433
 Mary I, queen of England, II, 209
Marzocco, II, 202, 234, 393
 Masefield, John, I, 320, II, 231, 365
 masked buds discloses, I, 144 f., II, 330; masked not, suspect, I, 183, 185
 masochism, psychopathic, Sh.'s, II, 238. *See* illnesses
 Mason, Lawrence, I, 337
 Masonic Brethren, Q addressed to, II, 164, 175
 masque, Sh.'s sonnets a, II, 45, 106 f., 165, 313 n.
 Massey, Gerald, I, 6 f., 39, 46 f., 57, 64, 78, 82, 89 ff., 116, 121, 136, 138, 155, 163, 174, 200, 214, 236, 245, 266, 277 f., 326 f., 329, 335, 345, 363, 371, 375, 377, II, 25, 46, 63, 93, 119 ff., 124, 140, 144, 168 f., 175 f., 185, 198, 207, 219 f., 247, 260 f., 281, 288, 354 n., 362; rearranges Q, II, 88 ff.
 Masson, David, I, 117, 275, II, 71, 77, 93, 139, 144, 197, 284 n., 361
 Masson, Rosaline, Mrs., II, 361
Master (*Mr.*), meaning of, II, 179, 221; proper usage of, II, 196, *et passim*, 227; such beauty as you master, I, 260 f.
 master-mistress, I, 54-58, II, 160 ff., 164, 184, 224, 228 f., 237. *See* homosexuality
 Mathew, Frank, I, 58, 371, II, 23 n., 25, 154, 174, 236, 271, 279, 310, 326
 matter, no such, I, 219 f.
 Matthews, Brander, II, 40, 375
 Matthison, Edith Wynne, II, 376 n.
 Mattingly, Garrett, I, 197, 267, II, 61, 68
 maturity, crawls to, I, 160 f.
 Mauntz, Alfred von, I, 8, 14, 31, 40, 55, 76, 83, 122, 149, 154, 170, 172, 179, 192, 204 f., 226, 305 f., 354, 389, II, 4 n., 56, 132, 144, 170 f., 177 f., 259, 261, 264, 267, 289, 385; rearranges Q, II, 93, 98 n.
 May, darling buds of, I, 50
 Mead, W. E., I, 361
 Meakin, Annette M. B., II, 339
Measure for Measure, I, 13, 15, 175, 351, II, 21, 265, 426; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64, 69
 measure, not my, I, 227
 medical knowledge, Sh.'s, I, 299. *See* Bucknill
 Meissner, Johannes, II, 205
 Meissner, Paul, I, 169, II, 254 f.
 melancholy (pronunciation), I, 125 f.; Sh.'s melancholy, I, 83 f., 189, II, 147 f., 151, 235, 258 n., 389, 392, 415 (*see* gloom; pessimism; sorrows)
 Melbancke, Brian, I, 306
Melophon, II, 315, 319
 memory, out of, I, 41 f.
 men, love sonnets to, conventional, II, 127, 132, 151, *et passim* (*see* conventions); two or more men in the sonnets, II, 100, 154, 159, 164, 177 f., 194, 206 f., 225, 230, 240, 245 f. (*see* man)
 mended, we are, I, 158 f.
 men's, all, "no," I, 381 f.
 merchandized, love is, I, 252
Merchant of Venice, I, 24, 38, 42, 64, 174, 180, 204, 242, 251, 259, 275, 376, II, 365; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64
 Merchant Venturers, Virginia (*q. v.*) and, Q refers to, II, 174
 Meres, Francis, I, 62, 147 ff., 290, 348, II, 43 n., 53 f., 62 f., 74, 121, 165, 205, 328
Merry Wives of Windsor, I, 38, 58,

- 379, 388, II, 246, 321 f.; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64
 metaphors, Sh.'s, II, 428. *See* comparisons
 metaphysical, the sonnets, I, 149, 294, 312, II, 357, 433 f., 436
 Metcalfe, W. C., II, 225 n.
 meter, notes on Sh.'s, I, 87 (*see* rhythm, rimes); stretched meter, I, 48 f., 209 (cf. II, 15, 18 n.)
Methodist Review, II, 244 n.
 Meyerfeld, Max, I, 56
 Mézières, Alfred, II, 139 f., 187, 250
 Michel, Francisque, II, 390
 Michelagnoli, Alfredo, II, 246 f., 394
 Michelangelo Buonarroti, II, 128 n., 392, 409; his sonnets resemble Sh.'s, I, 278, II, 127, 151, 158, 234 ff., 240
 Michigan, University of, Sh. study in, II, 369; *Studies in Sh.*, II, 17 n.
 Middleton, Thomas, II, 222 f., 309, 430
Midsummer Night's Dream, I, 18, 33, 82, 102, 213, 240, II, 223, 411; parallels with the sonnets, II, 63 f., 66, 68 f.
 Mierevelt, M. J. van, I, 46
 might (spelling), I, 117, II, 15
 Mildmay, H. St. J., Sir, II, 2, 5
 Miller, —, publisher, II, 355
 Miller, Helena F., II, 68
 millioned accidents, I, 291 f., II, 426
 Mills, L. J., I, 114, 343, 369
 Milton, John, I, 15, 22, 24, 30, 61, 85, 306, 339, 373, II, 329, 402, 408, 433; Benson and, II, 20 f.; sonnets, I, 200, II, 330 f., 336, 338–342, 344, 346 f., 350, 353, 355–358, 362 f., 369–373, 392, 400, 427
 mind, my eye is in my, I, 286; my most true, I, 286 ff.
 minds, unknown, I, 296 f.
 mine (= mien), I, 287 f.
 minion, I, 319, 321
 Minto, William, II, 54, 59, 78, 138, 170, 180, 197, 253, 277, 281 f., 284 f., 288
 minutes (=short spaces of time), I, 39 f.; wretched minutes, I, 319
 Mirabeau, H. G. R., comte de, I, 371
 Mirevelt: *see* Mierevelt
 mirror in a table-book, I, 198 f.
Mirror for Magistrates, II, 197, 281
Mirror, Reedy's, II, 376
 misprints and corruptions in Q, discussed, II, 7–18; other comments on, I, 33, 58, 91, 101, 177, 182, 197, 213, 215, 237 f., 284 f., 287 f., 354, 369, 378, II, 216, 218, 373, *et passim*. *See* dictating; handwriting; *their*
 misprision, growing upon, I, 219 f.
 misuse thee, oaths to, I, 389 f.
 Mitchell, C. B., II, 331, 339
 Mitchell, J. M., II, 130
 miter (=meter), I, 48, II, 15, 18 n.
 Mizener, Arthur, I, 311, 314, II, 377, 436
Modern Language Notes, I, 7, 9, 87, 102, 253, 266, 282, 330, II, 29 f., 66, 70, 183, 310 n., 331, 355
Modern Language Review, I, 57, 138, 149, 184, 335, 364, 395, II, 49, 60, 110, 378
Modern Philology, I, 174, 392, 396, II, 26, 126, 151, 160, 190, 222
 modern quill, I, 210 f.
 modesty, Sh.'s conventional, I, 44, 46 f., II, 278. *See* humility
 moiety, clear eyes', I, 127, 129
 Molière, J. B. P., II, 403 f.
 Moll, Albert, II, 235
 Molza, F. M., II, 292
 monarch's plague, flattery, I, 289
 monasteries, ruined, Sh. on, I, 190
 Moncur-Sime, A. H., I, 24
 Monday, Sarah, I, 150
 monosyllables, Sh.'s use of, I, 9, 122, 254, 294, II, 421 f.
 monotony, Sh.'s, I, 200, II, 379, 401
 Monson, Thomas, Sir, II, 193
 Montagu, Viscount: *see* Browne (Anthony)
 Montague, C. E., II, 230
 Montaigne, Michel de, I, 140, 337, 369, 375, II, 129
 Montégut, Émile, II, 390
Month, II, 206, 217 f., 228, 236, 272, 289
Monthly Anthology, II, 34
Monthly Criterion, II, 49, 221
Monthly Mirror, II, 249
Monthly Musical Record, II, 322
Monthly Review, II, 249, 335, 337, 339 f., 344
 monuments, gilded, of princes, I, 147, 150

- moods (=angry countenances), I, 231
 Moore, Hale, II, 289
 morality, Sh.'s, II, 137, 140 f., 251 ff., 257 f., 348, 359. *See* immorality
 more and less, of, I, 237; more hath more expressed, I, 65, 67 f.
More Books (Boston Public Library), II, 397
 More, Hannah, II, 339
 More, P. E., II, 146
 Morera y Galicia, M., II, 396
 Morgan, Appleton, I, 322, 345, II, 42, 77, 143, 145, 205
 Morhof, D. G., II, 378
 Morley, Christopher, I, 6, II, 54, 376 f.
 Morley, Edith J., II, 343, 345 f., 349, 358
 Morley, Thomas, II, 314
 morning (spelling), II, 15; morning sun, I, 338 f.
 Morris, William, I, 301
 Morrison, A. J. W., II, 133, 401
 Morsbach, Lorenz, I, 41, II, 54, 71, 150 f., 173, 174 n., 180
 Morse, B. J., II, 366 n.
 mortal moon, I, 263, 269; mortal rage, slave to, I, 169 f.; mortal war, I, 127 f.
 mortgaged to thy will, I, 342 f.
 Morton, David, II, 377
 Moseley, Humphrey, II, 29 n.
 Mother Hus (=Bacon), II, 229
 mother's glass, thy, I, 12 f., II, 214
 motion (=progression), I, 137 f.
 motley to the view, I, 275 ff.
 Motteux, Peter, II, 331 n.
 Moulijn-Haitsma Mulier, Hester H. J., II, 395
 mounted on the wind, I, 137
 Mountjoy, Lord: *see* Blount (Charles)
 mourning eyes, I, 338 f. (cf. II, 15)
 mouthed graves, I, 198 f., II, 57, 178
 moving, my, a star guides, I, 75, 77
 Moxon, Edward, II, 355
Much Ado about Nothing, I, 111, 144 f., 180, 224 ff., 242, II, 5, 249, 251, 265; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64, 66
 Mudie, Alfred, II, 164
 Müller, Joachim, II, 84, 423 ff.
 Muggeridge, Malcolm, II, 367
 Muir, Kenneth, I, 40, 56
 mulatto, the dark woman a, II, 243
 Mullany, P. F. (Brother Azarias), II, 158
 multiple authorship of Q, discussed, II, 46-52. *See* authenticity
 Munday, Anthony, II, 172, 278
 Munn, Margaret C., II, 266 f. n.
 Munro, John, I, 23, 45, 50, 79, 130, 256, 258, II, 19, 327
 Munroe, Edmund, II, 34 ff.
 Munroe, Isaac, II, 34
 Murden, A., II, 30
 murderer, Sh. a, I, 100. *See* immorality
 murderous shame, I, 26 f.
 Muretus (M. A. Muret), II, 132
 Murray, J. T., II, 225 n.
 Murrie, Eleanore B., II, 21 n.
 Murry, J. M., I, 209, 248, 264, 269, 276, II, 42, 49, 71, 83, 148, 192 f., 253, 287 f.
 MUS, II, 398
 muse (=poet), I, 60 f.; married to my muse, I, 208; resty muse, I, 248 f.; sonnet muse, the dark woman as the, II, 272, 274; tenth muse, I, 109, II, 105; tongue-tied muse, I, 214; truant muse, I, 250
 muses, filed by all the, I, 214 ff.
Museum of Foreign Literature and Science, II, 369
 music for the sonnets, I, 293, II, 211, 314-325; my music (=a woman), I, 326 f.; Sh. and music, I, 23 f.
Musical and Dramatic Courier, I, 327
 Musset, Alfred de, II, 404
 Mutschmann, Heinrich, I, 84, 111, 266, II, 153, 203 n.
 mutual ordering, by, I, 23 ff.
 mysticism, Sh.'s, II, 162
 Mytens, Daniel, II, 201, 204
 mythology in the sonnets, I, 143
 N., S. (=Charles Gildon), II, 29
Nagy Irók—Nagy Irások, II, 397
 naming thy name, I, 236
 Nancarrow, E. M., II, 125
 Napper, Edmund, II, 312
 Narcissus, I, 8, 19, 28
 Nares, Robert, I, 18, 70, 91
 Nashe, Thomas, I, 9, 61, 76, 93 f., 149, 176, 201, 234, 241, 314, 337, 354, II, 258, 267 f., 271, 291; part-author of Q, II, 46; on Lady Mani-

- better, II, 56; the rival poet, II, 51, 277, 281 f., 288, 290 f.
Nation (London), I, 331, II, 49, 155, 204, 251
Nation (New York), II, 204, 329 n., 368
 nativity in the main of light, I, 160 f.
 Nature, Dame, I, 15; nature bankrupt, I, 177 f.
 nature's truth, feeds on, I, 160, 162
 nautical expressions, Sh.'s, I, 204 f., 217, 295, II, 290. *See* sea terms
 Naylor, E. W., I, 24, 326
 Neal, Thomas, II, 202, 234, 393
 near, come so, I, 349 f.
 neck, one on another's, I, 336 f.
 Needham, Francis, II, 280 f.
 needy nothing, I, 174 f.
 ne'er-cloying sweetness, I, 298 f.
 negatives, double, I, 18, 218, Sh.'s fondness for brusque negatives, I, 317. *See* *neither*; *nor* . . . *nor*; or . . . or
 negress, the dark woman a, I, 333, 335, II, 243, 247, 258, 272
 Neidhardt, Alexander, II, 78, 141, 188, 383
 neigh, no dull flesh, I, 137 ff.
 Neil, Samuel ("Rector"), II, 169, 177, 213, 223, 247, 256 f., 302
 Neilson, W. A., I, 9, 31, 33, 49, 59, 61 f., 67, 71, 73, 85, 87, 97, 104, 107, 109, 122, 124 f., *et passim*, II, 9, 18 n., 68, 82, 152, 177 f., 231, 251
neither elided before *nor*, I, 218
 Nell, black-haired, and Sh., I, 370
 Nelson, W., II, 30
Neophilologus, II, 226, 237
 Neo-Platonism, Sh.'s, I, 8, 84, II, 409. *See* Plato
 Neri, Ferdinando, I, 175, II, 105, 193
 nerves of brass, I, 302
 Ness, F. W., I, 49, 89
 Nethercot, A. H., II, 270 f.
 Netherlands scenery, referred to, I, 149. *See* Holland
 Netto, Ilse, I, 96
Neue Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften, II, 379 n.
Neueren Sprachen, *Die*, II, 153 n.
New Adelpi, I, 248, 264, 269, II, 83
New Century Review, II, 213
New English Dictionary, I, 8 f., 11, 16-20, 26, 31, 33 f., 40, 42, 45 f., 48, 51, 59, 64, 66, 71, 76, 82, 87 f., 91, 93, 96 f., 104, 107 f., 114 f., 117, 128 f., 132, 136, 139, 141, 143, 146, 150, 152, 155, 157, 161, 164, 166, 168, 170, 173, 175-178, 180, 182, 186 ff., 194, 197, 201, 205, 208 f., 211, 225, 227, 229, 231, 236, 238, 240 ff., 249, 251 f., 254, 256, 261, 271-274, 277, 284, 287-290, 292, 296, 301, 305-308, 313, 317, 321, 324, 335 f., 340, 342, 346, 361, 370, 378, 380, 385, 388, 390, II, 15, 170, 173 f., 221 n.
New London Magazine, II, 340
New Monthly Magazine, II, 53, 85, 134 ff., 167, 233, 244, 353 f., 357, 369
New Shakespeareana, I, 266, II, 228, 264 n.
 New Shakspeare Society, II, 198, 222, 263; *Transactions*, I, 24, 70, II, 169, 204, 263 n., 319, 398; Swinburne burlesques, I, 106, 367
New Statesman, II, 238
New York Herald Tribune, II, 110
New-York Mirror, II, 369
New York Times, II, 225, 270, 308, 327, 377
 New Zealand, Q banned in, II, 338 n.
 Newbon, C. E., II, 271
 Newcomer, A. G., I, 121, 212
 Newdigate, B. H., I, 330, II, 226, 281
 Newdigate, John, Sir, II, 262 f. n.
 Newdigate-Newdegate, Anne E. G., Lady, II, 262, 264
 newfangled ill, I, 227
News-Letter, Sh. Fellowship, II, 230, 276
 Newton, R., II, 30
 Newton, Thomas, II, 220 n.
 next self, my, I, 340
 Nichols, J. B., II, 340
 Nicholson, Brinsley, I, 21, 32, 41, 52, 69, 73, 106, 174, 176, 196, 198, 200, 249, 287, 295, 374, II, 202 n.
 Nickalls, Barbara, II, 226 f.
 Nicoll, Allardyce, II, 49. *See* Calina
 Nietzsche, Friedrich, II, 142 f.
 niggard, beauteous, I, 15 f.; niggard truth, I, 187
 night, age's steepy, I, 167 f.; Death and, Sh. on, I, 88, 189; hell and, I, 373, 380; hideous, I, 32 f.; night of woe, I, 302 f.; School of, II, 284-288, 310 f.

- nightingale, Sh. on the, I, 252 f.
Nineteenth Century, II, 3 n., 46, 92,
 143, 261, 283
 nis (=is not), I, 282
 Nisbet, J. F., II, 149
 Nisbet, Ulric, II, 227
 "no," all men's, I, 381 f.
 Noble, J. A., II, 142, 405 f.
 Noble, Richmond, II, 125 n.
 none or few, I, 189 f.
 nor no, I, 17 f.
 nor . . . nor, I, 190
Nord und Süd, II, 120, 141, 233, 260
North American Review, II, 98
 "North, Christopher": see Wilson
 (John)
 North, Thomas, Sir, I, 22
 Northumberland, Earl of: see Percy
 (Henry)
 Norway, the sonnets in, II, 396
Nosotros, II, 397
Notes and Queries, I, 7, 10, 50 f., 73,
 75, 106, 151, 154 f., 162, 170, 174,
 176, 197 f., 200, 247, 249, 257, 266,
 287, 293, 295, 318-321, 374, 376 f.,
 II, 8, 37 n., 47, 55, 159, 168, 173,
 183 f., 203 n., 213, 216, 222-225,
 243, 262 n., 277, 280, 282 f., 289 n.,
 290, 302, 343, 363, 399
 nothing (adverb), I, 309, 333 f.
 Nottingham, Earl of: see Howard
 (Charles)
Nouvelle revue, II, 272, 391
Nouvelle revue française, I, 55
 Novello, Ewer, and Company, II,
 316, 320, 322
 Novello, Vincent, II, 318 f., 323
 Noyes, Alfred, I, 183, 294, II, 105,
 154 f., 177 f., 187, 260; on the
 relation of the sonnets to *Lucrece*,
 I, 330, II, 154, to *Venus*, I, 245 f.,
 320, II, 154, 241
 Nulli, S. A., II, 377
 number, one no, I, 350. See one
 numbers, eternal, I, 109; in fresh
 numbers number, I, 48; my gra-
 cious numbers, I, 203
Nuova antologia, II, 144 n., 198, 235
 n., 259 n., 263 n., 393
Nutbrown Maid, I, 324
 Nyblom, C. R., II, 396

 O, Sh.'s fondness for, I, 29
 oaths, deep, I, 389 f.
 Oberndorfer, M. E., II, 317
 oblivion, razed, I, 307 f.
 obscenity, Sh.'s, I, 13, 54-59, 346 f.,
 371, 387 f., II, 48, 138, 149, 158,
 186, 217, 239. See immorality
 obscurity, Sh.'s, II, 128, 146, 347 f.,
 351, 359, 362, 376, 382, 390, 398,
 400, 418, 431
 obsequious in thy heart, I, 315, 317;
 obsequious tear, I, 90 f.
 ocean, the hungry, and the shore, I,
 169 ff.; interim like the, I, 152 f.
 (cf. II, 8 n.)
 O'Connell, J., I, 338
 O'Connor, W. D., II, 159, 173, 183,
 229
 o'ergreen my bad, I, 283 f.
 o'erlook, without attaint, I, 208
 o'erpressed defense, I, 356
 o'erread, I, 206 f.
 o'ersnowed, I, 17 f.
 o'erworn, crushed and, I, 167 f.
 Østerberg, Valdemar, I, 96, 170, 235,
 II, 396
 of, verbal noun with, I, 292, 325;
 (=from), I, 107
 offense, slow, I, 137
 Ogle, M. B., I, 246, 324, 394
 Okakura, Yoshisaburo, II, 398
 old age, Sh. on, I, 10, 31, 272; refer-
 ences to his own, I, 13, 63, 165 ff.,
 354 f., II, 57 f., 123, 138, 147 f.,
 161, 187, 200, 240, 329 (see age's;
 conventions); make my old excuse,
 I, 10 f.
 Oldys, William, I, 231, II, 256, 269 f.,
 307, 314
 Oliphant, E. H. C., II, 343 n.
 Oliver, Edward, II, 34
 olives of endless age, I, 263, 270, II,
 364
 Olivieri, Angelo, I, 193, II, 144 n., 170,
 198, 234, 263 n., 393
 O'Loughlin, Sean, I, 40, 56
 one is no number, I, 25; one is
 reckoned none, I, 349 f.
 O'Neil, James, II, 39 n.
 O'Neill, Rose, I, 57
 Onions, C. T., I, 12, 33, 37, 40, 49, 59,
 64, 70, 76, 79, 90 f., 104, 107, 115,
 121, 139, 143, 161, 175 f., 202, 209,
 229, 231, 234, 246, 254, 259, 272,
 295, 299, 321, 336
 only (=principal, peerless), I, 9;

- only begetter, I, 3, II, 166-176,
179, *et passim*
Ons eigen Tijdschrift, II, 395 n.
Opzoomer, C. W., II, 214
or (=gold), I, 33
or . . . or, I, 190, 206 f.; or whether,
I, 289
Ord, Hubert, II, 125, 154, 228, 273,
292
Orger, J. G., I, 172 f.
orient, I, 21, II, 8 n.
Ormsby, W. E., I, 197
ornament, I, 9; ornament of beauty,
I, 183 f.; without all ornament, I,
179 f.
ornaments, scarlet, I, 363 f.; signifi-
cance of the ornaments in Q, II, 4 n.
orphans, hope of, I, 239 f.
Orsini, Napoleone, II, 394
Ortlepp, Ernst, II, 250, 383
Othello, I, 76, 88, 118, 202, 219, 281,
297, 302, 306, 316, 339, 370, II,
39 n., 153, 243, 365, 378; parallels
with the sonnets, II, 64, 66
other (plural), I, 165 f., 216, 364; that
other mine, I, 340, 342 f.
Otis, J. F., II, 244, 370
Oulton, W. C., I, 24, 116, 125, 272,
277 f., 363, II, 22 n., 33-36, 40, 53,
328, 348
out (=blinded), I, 286 f.
outgoing in thy noon, I, 21 f.
outward, honoring the, I, 315 f.; thy
outward, I, 181 f.
outworn buried age, I, 169 f.; outworn
days, I, 179
overgoes my invention, I, 254
Overland Monthly, I, 92, II, 375
overplus, Will in, I, 344, 347, II, 366
Ovid, I, 31, 40, 51, 55, 76, 122, 143,
145, 149, 151, 154, 172, 205, 226,
389, II, 22, 53 f., 288; *Meta-*
morphoses, Sh.'s borrowings from,
I, 8, 28, 42, 52, 55, 99, 111, 123,
147 ff., 158-161, 168, 170 f., 310,
321, II, 130 ff.
owe (=own), I, 183, 185
Owen, D. E., I, 334 f.
Owen, R., II, 333
ow'st, fair thou, I, 50 f.
Oxford, Earls and Countesses of: *see*
Vere (de)
oxymoron, Sh.'s fondness for, I, 25,
388
P., G. W., II, 138, 372
P., T. W., II, 371
P., W. G., II, 225
pace forth, I, 147, 151
Padelford, F. M., II, 209 n.
Padua, Italy, Sh.'s sonnet on its
springs, I, 395
Padulli, Piero, II, 394
Page, William, I, 106
pain (=punishment), I, 360, 362
painful warrior, I, 73 f.
painted beauty, I, 60
painter, Sh. a, I, 70
painting (=depicting in words), I,
210, II, 277, 279; Sh. and painting,
I, 69 ff.; women's painting at-
tacked, I, 61, 177-180, 324
Palatine Anthology, sonnets related
to the, I, 391-397
Palgrave, F. T., I, 31, 103, 106 f.,
134, 169, 193, 211, 225, 242, 267,
295, 312 f., 343, 348, 374, 380, II,
6, 88, 142, 169, 197, 293, 362
Palk, Robert, II, 44, 229, 273
Pall Mall Magazine, I, 207
Palmer, G. H., II, 375 ff.
palmistry, a conceit from, I, 45
paper (=poem), I, 109
Par, Alfonso, II, 266 n., 378
Paradise of Dainty Devices, I, 88, II,
75, 220 n.
paradoxical phrases, Sh.'s use of, I, 25
parallels, delves, I, 160 ff., II, 329;
parallels in Q to the other works,
tabulated, II, 63-69
paralytic, Sh. a, II, 149. *See* illnesses
paranoia, Sh.'s, II, 266
Paré, Ambroise, I, 193, 282
parentheses, equal to commas, I, 186,
II, 16 f., or to hyphens, I, 218;
indicate missing lines, I, 238, 319,
321 f., II, 7
Park, Thomas, II, 299 n., 301
Parker, Munroe, Francis, II, 35
parodies in Q, I, 55, II, 50, 141, 285.
See satires
Parrott, T. M., I, 199, 229, 316, II,
232, 252, 427
Parry, C. H. H., Sir, II, 314, 316 f.,
319 f., 323
Parry, J. H., II, 316
Parry, J. J., I, 63
Parsons (or Persons), Robert, S. J.,
I, 313

- part (=go away), I, 132 f.; all my every part, I, 165; each part in me, I, 206 f.; part his function, I, 286 f.
- partake against myself, I, 383
- participle, preterite used as a, I, 390; Sh.'s strong form of the, I, 130; used without a noun, I, 332
- Partridge, Eric, I, 347
- parts (=good qualities), I, 48; parts in singleness, I, 23 f.
- pass, no other, to, I, 254
- passion, master-mistress (*q. v.*) of my, I, 57 f.
- Passionate Pilgrim*, I, 21, II, 11 n., 42 f., 47, 54, 70, 188, 292, 344, 389, 391 n., 401; Lintott's and later editions of, II, 36-40; pirated by Benson, II, 20-23, 25-28, 334 f.; poems from, reprinted with the sonnets, II, 87 f., 92 f., 97, 117, 334; Steevens on, II, 338; two sonnets of Q in, I, 353 ff., 368-371, II, 3, 26, 53 ff., 69, 72, 205, 268, 307; *Willobie* and, II, 302 n., 303 n., 306 n., 307, 312
- "Paston, George": *see* Symonds (Emily M.)
- patent, my, I, 219 f.
- Paterson, C., II, 30, 31 n.
- patron, poet and, conventions surrounding, II, 240 f.; Sh.'s, the Countess of Pembroke, II, 291; Sh.'s two patrons, II, 194, 208, 248 (*see under* friend)
- pattern, you, I, 241 ff.
- Pattison, Mark, II, 343
- Paul, H. N., II, 36 f., 40, 367
- pauses in Sh.'s sonnets, I, 100, 116, 167, 294, II, 7 f., 413, 422, 429 f. *See* structure
- Pavier, Thomas, II, 19
- Payne, T., Jr., II, 40
- Payson and Clarke, II, 2
- peace of you, I, 194
- Peacham, Henry, I, 144
- Peake, Robert, I, 69
- Pearson, Lu E., on love conventions (*q. v.*), I, 63, 369, II, 128, 153, 254, 292
- Pease, A. S., I, 140
- pebbled shore, I, 160, II, 15, 410
- Peck, W. E., I, 279, 281, II, 351
- pederast, Marlowe a, II, 236; Sh. a, II, 233 f. *See* homosexuality
- Peele, George, I, 14, 94, 314, 334 f.; the rival poet, II, 277, 282, 289, 291
- Pember, F. W., I, 50, 255
- Pemberton, Henry, Jr., I, 107, 266, II, 207, 264 n.
- Pembroke, Earls and Countesses of: *see* Herbert
- pen, every alien, I, 201 (*see* alien); my pupil (*q. v.*) pen, I, 44, 46
- pencil (=word-painting), I, 250 f.; this time's pencil, I, 44, 46 f.
- Penelope Taschenbuch* (ed. Theodor Hell), II, 53, 85, 134, 186, 249, 383
- Penner, Emil, II, 150
- Pennink, Renetta, II, 378, 395
- pent in thee, I, 340 f.
- penury, lean, I, 212, II, 284
- Percy, Henry, ninth Earl of Northumberland, Q alludes to, II, 183
- Percy, Thomas, Bishop, II, 331, 340
- "Perdita": *see* Robinson (Mary)
- perfect'st love, I, 137 f. (cf. II, 15)
- Pericles*, I, 58, 93, II, 19, 36; parallels with the sonnets, II, 65
- periphrasis, I, 238
- Perry, Bliss, II, 371 n.
- personification, Sh. and, II, 415
- perspective, best art, I, 69 ff.
- pessimism, Sh.'s, I, 83, 175, 189. *See* melancholy
- Petersen, Julius, I, 273
- Petrarch, Francesco, and Sh.'s Petrarchanism, I, 7, 32, 60, 63, 65, 69, 79, 83, 113, 127 f., 142, 175, 191, 204, 245, 276, 287, II, 61, 118 f., 125-128, 132, 146, 151, 153 n., 158, 240 ff., 253, 278, 290, 292, 332 f., 337, 341 f., 355, 370 f., 379, 386, 388 ff., 392, 398, 403, 409, 416, 435; Sh.'s anti-Petrarchanism, I, 333 f., 354, II, 252, 254 f., 435; sonnet-form of Petrarch, structure of the, I, 92, II, 343, 407 f., 412, 417, 427, 431
- Petronius Arbiter, I, 330
- Pettie, George, I, 184
- petty griefs, other, I, 225 f.
- Pforzheimer, C. H., II, 295 n.
- Phaon: *see* Sappho
- Phelps, W. L., I, 18, II, 149
- Philadelphia, first American Sh. issued in, II, 39 f., 367

- Philip II, king of Spain, I, 265
 Phillips, Edward, II, 330
 Phillips, G. W., II, 45 f., 107 f., 125, 218 f., 275 f., 282
 Phillips, Gerald, II, 276 n.
Philological Quarterly, I, 59, 293, II, 17, 68, 343 n., 394 n.
 Philological Society, *Transactions*, I, 61, 161
 Philomel(a), the nightingale, I, 252 f.
 philosophy, false, the dark woman as, II, 275; the friend as philosophy, II, 228; Sh.'s philosophy, I, 108, 123, II, 162 f., 292 (see Bruno; Plato; stoicism)
 Phipson, Emma, I, 79
Phoenix and the Turtle, I, 25, 40, 104, 250, 287, 350, II, 185, 327, 338, 371; Benson and, II, 20 f., 25, 27; later reprints of, II, 36, 40
 phoenix, burn the, in her blood, I, 52 f. (cf. II, 8 f. n.)
Phoenix Nest, I, 13 f., 334
 phonograph records of the sonnets, II, 376 n.
 phrase, precious, I, 214 f., II, 279
 physician, reason the, I, 379 f.
 pibbled (spelling), II, 15
 Pichot, Amédée, II, 388 f.
 Pickering, William, II, 355
 Pierce, F. E., II, 150
Piers Plowman, II, 430
 pilgrimage (=love suit), I, 78 f.
 Pincherle, Giacomo, II, 392
 Pindar, I, 51
 pine and surfeit, I, 194 f.; let that pine, I, 374, 378
 Pinkerton, John, II, 337, 339
 Piotrowski, Konstanty, II, 398
 pitch, above a mortal, I, 217, II, 278, 286, 288; high-most pitch, I, 21 f.
 pitied be, to, I, 363 f.
 pity-wanting pain, I, 358
 plague, false, I, 351 f., II, 422; remedies for the plague, I, 281 f.
 plagues, references to, I, 39, II, 148
Plain Dealer, II, 333
 Planché, J. R., I, 180
 Planudean Anthology, sonnets related to the, I, 391-397
 Platen-Hallermund, August, Graf von, II, 186, 382 f.
 Plato and Sh.'s Platonism, I, 6 f., 52, 55 f., 90, 128, 142, 258 f., 269, 369, II, 78, 128, 131, 146, 157 ff., 161 f., 233 ff., 238, 252, 409, 413, 417, 430. See Neo-Platonism; Simpson (Richard)
 Platt, Arthur, I, 364
 Playford, John, II, 21 f. n.
 plays on words, I, 49, 69, 76, 121, 132, 182, 256, 345, II, 185 n. See conceits; puns; repetition
 plays, Sh.'s, the dark woman in, II, 249, 251 f., 265 ff., 269, 272; Q gives their history, II, 163 f.; regarded by him as unimportant, I, 92, 149
 pleasure of the fleeting year, I, 239
 Pléiade, the, I, 245, II, 240
 Pliny, the elder, I, 53, 395
 Plomer, H. R., II, 20, 31 n., 268 n.
 plot, several, I, 351 f.
 Plotinus, II, 131
 pluck, I my judgment, I, 39; pluck thee back, I, 319, 321
 Plumptre, E. H., I, 395, II, 304
 plural nouns, archaic, I, 31, 231, 289 (see horse; other; sense); plural verbs, archaic, I, 116 f., 236 (see -s; -th; verb-form)
 Plutarch's *Lives*, I, 22
 poacher, Sh. a, II, 4 n., 148
 Poel, William, II, 154, 271, 309, 376 n.
 poems, Sh.'s, his attitude towards, I, 92, 149, 206. See *Lover's Complaint*; *Lucrece*; *Passionate Pilgrim*; *Phoenix and the Turtle*; *Venus*
Poetical Rhapsody, I, 218, 256, II, 75, 226. See Davison (Francis)
 poet-laureateship, Sh. and the, II, 280
Poet-Lore, II, 160, 198, 208, 220, 263
Poetry and the Play, II, 107, 161
Poetry Review, I, 57, II, 75
 poets, both your, I, 210 f., II, 277, 283, 290
 pointing (=appointing), I, 39 f.
 points on me, a star, I, 75, 77
 Poland, the sonnets in, II, 398
 policy in love, I, 298 f.; policy that heretic, I, 311 f.
 politic, hugely, I, 311, 313
 political sonnets, I, 263, 311, 315, II, 147
 Poliziano, Angelo, II, 234, 240
 Pollard, A. F., II, 194
 Pollard, A. W., II, 2, 3 n., 10, 60, 192, 218

- Pollock, Frederick, Sir, II, 154
 Polwhele, William, II, 262
Polychorda, II, 381
 polysyllables, use of, in Q, I, 37, II, 422
 Pomfret, John, II, 337
 Pongs, Hermann, II, 415
 Ponsonby, William, II, 75
 Poole, Joshua, II, 329 f.
 Pooler, C. K., I, 8 f., 11-16, 18 f., 22, 24, 26-31, 33 f., 37 f., 40, 42, 44 ff., 48 f., 51, 53 ff., 57 f., 61, 64, 66 f., *et passim*, II, 3, 9 n., 10, 22 n., 23 f. n., 27, 29, 48, 75, 100, 104, 118, 121, 123, 173 f., 185, 205, 218 n., 231, 286 f.
 poor, rude lines, Sh.'s, I, 92 f., II, 420
 Pope, Alexander, I, 206, II, 30, 31 n., 269, 331 ff., 345, 357, 431, 433
 Popović, Vladeta, II, 378
 popularity and unpopularity of Sh.'s sonnets, II, 326-399
Port Folio, II, 243, 368
 Porter, Charlotte, I, 13, 18, 21, 38, 41, 57, 91, 101, 107, 112, 114, 117, 122, 128, 130 f., 148, 157, 200, 262, 302, 317, 328, 355, 369 f., 372, 377, 382, 390, II, 160, 204 f., 231
Portuguese Nun, Letters of a, II, 149
 possessing, too dear for my, I, 219
 possessive without 's, I, 60 f.
Post-Boy, II, 37, 243
 posting, of, no need, I, 137
 Pott, Constance M., II, 163, 207, 274 f.
 poverty (=inferior matter), I, 254; all my poverty, I, 113, 115; Sh.'s poverty, I, 105-108
 Powell, Thomas, II, 356 n.
 Powis, Baron: *see* Herbert (William)
 Praetorius, Charles, II, 2, 8 n., 98, 262 n.
 Pratt, Marjory B., II, 377
 Prayer Book, I, 165, 199 f., 294
 Praz, Mario, I, 7, 330, II, 50, 144 n., 221, 237, 394
 predict, by oft, I, 39 f.
 Preetzman, Caspara, II, 396
 preposition, syllepsis of the, I, 133
 preposterously stained, I, 273 f.
 presage, mock their own, I, 263, 269 f.
 presagers, dumb, I, 65 ff.
 present-absent, I, 125
 Preston, William, II, 344
 presume not on, I, 63 f.
 pretty wrongs, these, I, 116 f.
Preussische Jahrbücher, I, 55 f., 149, 245, II, 63, 144, 191, 214, 234, 244, 250 f., 282, 291, 384
 prevenst (spelling), I, 117, 248 f., II, 15
 prevent our maladies, I, 298 f.
 Price, H. T., I, 10, II, 239
 Price, L. M., II, 378
 Price, T. R., I, 11 f., 32 f., 37, 41, 54, 86, 163, II, 67 n., 145
 pricked thee out, Nature, I, 54, 59
 pride, imprisoned, his, I, 140 f.
 prime, pure, unstained, I, 183, 185, II, 15, 178; wanton burthen of the prime, I, 239 f.
 primitivism, Sh.'s, I, 380
primus motor of Q, II, 84
 printer, Sh. a, I, 69
 private widow, every, I, 26
 privilege your time, I, 156 f.
 prize, triumphant, I, 387 f.
 prizing, not, I, 366 f.
 procreation sonnets, I, 1-49, II, 22, 120 f., 124, 127 f., 137, 147, 159, 161 f., 170, 186, 192, 200, 206, 209 f., 212 n., 218, 224 f., 230 f., 233 ff., 241, 243 f., 246 ff., 259, 379, 408, 414, 423; refer to *Hamlet*, II, 159, to wine, II, 160 f. *See* marriage
 Procrustes's bed, the sonnet like, II, 326, 336 f., 342, 379
 procurer, *begetter* meaning, discussed, II, 166-176
 proem, sonnets as a, I, 77
 profane, too much, I, 223 f.
 prone to base touches, I, 360 f.
 pronoun of address, Sh.'s, I, 35 ff. *See* *thou* and *you*
 pronouns, Sh.'s personal, changed by Benson, II, 20, 75, 133, 236, 243 f., 329, and by Poole, II, 329
 pronunciation, Sh.'s archaic, I, 17, 31, 125 f., 135, 140, 155, 176, 185, 187, 204, 282, 347 f., 367. *See* accentuation; Ellis (A. J.); rimes
 proofreading of Q, Sh. not concerned in the, I, 238, 322, 372, II, 6, 8 ff., 15, 18, 80
 Propertius, I, 51, II, 132
 prophetic soul, I, 263, 268 f., II, 66, 410, 422
 Prothero, R. E., first Baron Ernle, II, 341

- proud, flesh, of this pride, I, 387 f.;
 proud, full sail, I, 217, II, 277-281, 283 f., 286, 289
 proudly (=through pride), I, 336
 proud-pied: *see* April
 Prouty, G. T., I, 189 f.
 prove (=bring to the test), I, 75, 77; (=find), I, 187
 proved, bliss, a woe, I, 329, II, 17, 18 n.; proved upon me, I, 293, 295
 Provençal enueg, example of the, I, 174
 proverbs, I, 22, 25, 49, 64, 99, 117, 120, 187, 200, 234 f., 253, 278, 290, 295, 301, 348, 350, 359, II, 287 n. *See* Apperson; Jente; Smith (W. G.); Tilley
 proving his beauty thine, I, 10 f.
 psycho-analyzed, Sh., II, 266, 276
Psychological Record, I, 86
 Ptolemaic system, Sh. and the, I, 21
 public (=in public), I, 103 f.; public means, public manners, I, 279, 281
Public Opinion, II, 213 n., 214 n., 257
 publication, Sh.'s sonnets not intended for, I, 93
Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, I, 56, 117, 197, 208, 267, 279, 376, 382, 388, II, 17 n., 34, 40, 59, 61, 68, 98 f., 179, 185, 187 n., 209 n., 213, 312, 313 n., 323
 publish (=make known), I, 252
 "Pudor, Proh" (?John Wilson), II, 134 n., 249 n., 350
 Puig, C. M., II, 397
 punctuation, Sh.'s, I, 13, 18, 47, 57, 157, II, 6 ff., 10 f., 16 f., 429; "exquisite" examples of, I, 381 f., 388, II, 272. *See* colon; Simpson (Percy)
 puns, Sh.'s, I, 13, 38, 56, 59, 69, 142, 155, 213, 323, 339, 344, 351, 354, 371, 381 f., 387, II, 181, 184 f., 194, 203, 226, 260, 290, 344, 387, 408. *See* plays on words
 pupil pen, my, I, 44, 46 f., II, 58, 200, 204
 Purday, C. H., II, 315, 319
 Puritans, Sh. on, I, 175, 304 ff. (cf. II, 219). *See* religion
 purity of the sonnets, Benson (*q. v.*) on, II, 23 ff. (*see* immorality); purity or impurity of Sh.'s love for his friend, II, 137, 147, 232-239, *et passim*
 purple pride, I, 244, 246
 pursuit (accent), I, 367 (cf. II, 15)
 Pushkin, Alexander, I, 51, II, 398
 Puttenham, George, I, 143, 327, 347 f.
 pyramids, I, 309, II, 9 n.
 qualify, my flame to, I, 273
 Quaritch, Bernard, Ltd., II, 225
 Quarles, Francis, II, 402
Quarterly Review, I, 123, 148, 158, 279, 321, II, 132, 182, 238 n., 281 n., 310, 341 f., 354, 362 f., 404
Quest, II, 54, 275
 quest, in, to have, I, 329, 331 f., II, 17; quest of thoughts, I, 127, 129
 question make (=entertain doubt), I, 32 f.
 question mark used for exclamations, I, 239, II, 16 f.
 quick objects, eye's, I, 286 f.
 quicker elements, I, 125
 quietus, I, 319, 321, II, 66, 181
 Quiller-Couch, Arthur, Sir, I, 90, 95, 210, II, 310 n.
 quotation marks, use of, in Q, I, 40, 139, 235
 R., II, 261
 R. *alias* Sh., II, 50
 R., J., I, 266
 R., J. G., I, 266, II, 283
 R., M., II, 136 f.
 race, fiery, in his, I, 137 ff.
 Racine, Jean, II, 148
 rack, ugly, I, 95 f.
 Racster, John, II, 399
 rage, barren, I, 35, 38; poet's, I, 48 f., II, 351; slave to mortal, I, 169 f.; this rage of mortality, I, 172
 ragged hand, winter's, I, 19 (cf. II, 15)
 rainy morrow, I, 225
 Raleigh, Elizabeth Throgmorton, Lady, II, 44, 273
 Raleigh, Walter, Lady, II, 112
 Raleigh, Walter, Professor Sir, II, 42, 71, 82, 112, 131, 146, 218, 231
 Raleigh, Walter, Sir, I, 217, II, 255, 419; author of the sonnets, I, 107, II, 43 n., 44, 159, 173, 183, 207, 229,

- 273; lameness of, I, 107; the rival poet, II, 293; *Willobie* and, II, 310 f.
- Ralli, Augustus, II, 149, 158
- Ramsey, Lady, of Banff, II, 316
- Randegger, Alberto, II, 323
- Randolph, Thomas, I, 63 f.
- Randolph-Macon College *Bulletin*, II, 161 n.
- random, at, I, 379 f., II, 15
- Rang, F. C., I, 159, II, 237
- ranged (=been inconstant), I, 273 f.
- rank, idle, I, 307; rank of goodness, I, 298 f.; rank smell of weeds, I, 181 f.; rank thoughts, I, 304, 306
- Ransom, J. C., I, 33, 74, 95, 149, 170, 189 f., 376, II, 432 ff., 436
- Rathbone, Basil, II, 376 n.
- Rattray, R. F., II, 185
- raven black, eyes, I, 323 f., II, 264
- Raysor, T. M., I, 55, II, 232, 347, 349
- razed oblivion, I, 307 f.
- read such art, I, 39 f.
- rearrangements of the sonnets, II, 20 f., 74 f., 85-116, 245
- rearward of a conquered woe, I, 225
- reason, the physician, I, 379 f., II, 273; stays no farther reason, I, 387 f.
- rebel powers, these, I, 374, 376 ff.
- receipt, great, I, 349 f.
- recite, task you to, I, 187
- recited, the sonnets, among Sh.'s friends, I, 110; by Garrick, II, 350
- record (accent), I, 16, 158 f., 310
- recordings, phonographic, of the sonnets, II, 376 n.
- records, time's, lie, I, 309 f., II, 55 n. "Rector": see Neil
- recured (=made complete), I, 125 f.
- Redin, Mats, II, 177
- Reed, E. B., I, 8, 37, 53, 56, 101, 104, 112, 138, 200, 211, 213, 216, 225, 267, 269, 272, 284, 290, 310, 312, 314, 318, 331, 347, 370, 372, II, 43, 72, 103, 148, 232, 248
- Reed, Henry, II, 369 f., 372
- Reed, Isaac, I, 85
- Reedy, W. M., *Mirror*, II, 376
- Reekes, John, II, 316 f., 320 ff.
- reeks, breath, I, 333, 335, II, 242 f.
- reeleth from the day, I, 21 f.
- refigured (=represented anew), I, 19 f.
- Regianus, I, 393 f.
- region cloud, I, 95, 97, II, 230, 268, 289
- Regis, Gottlob, I, 13, 82, 273, 393, II, 76, 132, 187, 249, 383
- registers, time's, Sh. defies, I, 309 f., II, 55 n.
- rehearse (=mention), I, 60 f.
- Reichel, Eugen, II, 44, 174 n., 182, 223, 274
- reign, in their badness, I, 304, 306
- Reign of King Edward III*: see *Edward III*
- Reimer, Hans, I, 167, 287
- Reinecke, Otto, II, 105
- relative pronoun omitted, I, 16, 343
- religion, Sh.'s notes on, I, 375, II, 130, 151, 157, 159, 161 f., 361. See Catholic; Christ; Puritans
- religious love, dear, I, 90 f.
- remembered (=reminded), I, 302 f.
- removed, things, I, 90 f.; this time removed, I, 239
- remover, with the, I, 293 f.
- Rendall, G. H., I, 214, II, 17, 52, 61, 83, 107, 275
- render, mutual, I, 315, 317; render thee, I, 319, 321
- Renoldes, William, II, 327
- Repertory*, II, 34
- repetition, examples of Sh.'s, I, 15, 121, 134, 141, 174, 190, 234, 349, 377, II, 65 ff., 117, 361, 410, 437. See plays on words
- replete with you, I, 286 f., II, 17
- repose (=bed), I, 136; dear repose, I, 78 f.
- reserve (=preserve), I, 92 f.; reserve their character, I, 214 f., II, 280 n.
- respect, one, in our two loves, I, 103 f.
- respects, advised, I, 134
- resty (restive) muse, I, 248 f.
- resurvey, I, 92 f.
- retention, poor, I, 307 f.
- Retrospective Review*, II, 353, 400 f.
- Return from Parnassus*, II, 191
- revenues, beds', robbed, I, 363 f.
- Review of English Studies*, I, 57, 346, 371, 395, II, 8, 10, 60, 103 f., 216 n., 246
- Review of Reviews* (London), II, 192, 366
- revolution, whether, be the same, I, 158 f.

- Revue anglo-américaine*, I, 346
Revue d'art dramatique, II, 390 f. n.
Revue de Hongrie, II, 151, 235
Revue de Paris, I, 314, II, 223, 252, 261, 282
Revue des deux mondes, II, 70, 130, 143, 158, 170, 187, 233, 256, 264 n., 389, 391 n.
 Rewcastle, George, II, 192 n.
 Reynolds, J. H., II, 351
 rhetoric, strained touches of, I, 208 f., II, 8 n., 277
 rhythm, Sh.'s, I, 54, 87, 261, 282, 303, 376, II, 118, 349, 356; abnormal, examples of, I, 327, 331, 382, 387. *See* meter
 Ricci, Seymour de, II, 225
 Rice Institute *Pamphlet*, II, 151
 Rice, Robert, Sir, I, 54, 223 f., II, 182 f., 216, 229, 275
 rich, proud cost, I, 169 f.; rich in will, I, 344, II, 273
 Rich, Barnabe, the rival poet, II, 277
 Rich, Penelope Devereux, Lady, featured in the sonnets, II, 45, 89 f., 207, 230, 252, 260 f., 267, 273 f.; Sh.'s mistress, II, 261
 Rich, Robert, third Baron Rich, II, 274
Richard II, I, 22, 51, 70, 88, 170, 240, 242, 268, 296, 303, 378, 380; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64, 66, 69
Richard III, I, 33, 43, 64, 117, 132, 138, 155, 173, 303; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64 ff.
 Richardson, D. L., I, 55, II, 46, 85, 133 f., 136, 140, 167, 177, 256, 342, 357
 Richardson, William, II, 34 f.
 riches (singular), I, 219
 Richmond, Oliffe, I, 214 f.
 Richter, Helene, I, 84, II, 124, 192, 237, 252, 291
 Richter, Karl, II, 383
 Rick, Leo, I, 8, 28, 170, II, 132
 Ricordi, Giulio, II, 320
 rid my pain, I, 356 f.
 Riding, Laura, I, 331 f., II, 366
 Ridley, M. R., I, 24, 49, 107, 116, 136, 156 f., 177, 182, 184, 193, 213, 215, 269, 339, 382, II, 11, 72, 75, 108 f., 155, 232, 252, 288
 right, the freedom of that, I, 127 f.
 rights, your true, I, 48 f.
 Riley, H. T., I, 53
 rime (=poem), I, 48 f.; rime-links, II, 104 f. (*see* links)
 rimes, Sh.'s, comments on, I, 7, 11, 31, 54 f., 59, 87, 89, 99, 119, 135, 163, 176, 216, 219, 228, 282, 294, 347, 373, II, 117, 387, 408, 432; feminine, I, 54 f., 219, II, 431, statistics about, II, 67; masculine, II, 67 n.; repeated, in various sonnets, I, 9, II, 410; sonnets in less than seven, I, 12, 344. *See* accentuation; assonance; meter; pronunciation; scansion
 riper (=older), I, 5, 8; riper days, growth of, I, 252 f.
 rite, ceremony of love's, I, 65 f., II, 127
 Ritson, Joseph, II, 301
 Ritter, Albert, II, 180, 221, 385
 rival poet or poets, the, II, 133, 145, 244, 327; attacked, I, 61, 177, 196, II, 122; discussed, II, 277-294; identified as Barnes, II, 124, as Chaucer, II, 125, as a conventional figure, II, 128, as Dante, II, 128, as the dark woman's lover, II, 244, as Daniel, II, 117, as G., II, 50, as Marlowe, II, 89, as Nashe, II, 51, as Sh., II, 226, as Tasso, II, 128; no early references to, II, 327; reality or unreality of, II, 133, *et passim*; sonnets dealing with, I, 68, 195-198, 201-205, 208-218, 253, 302, 317 f., II, 101, 162, 277, concern Elizabeth, II, 249 n., 257, 278
 Rivas, José Pablo, II, 397
Rivista d'Italia, I, 263, II, 72, 105, 171, 190, 207, 233, 394
 Robbie, H. J. L., II, 216 n.
 Robbins, Alfred, II, 37 n.
 Robertson, J. G., II, 377 f.
 Robertson, J. M., I, 65, 67, 102, 145, 148 f., 203, 235, 246, 267, 276, 297, 316, 331, 346, 364, 375, 385, 387 f., II, 3, 24 n., 48-51, 72, 105, 151, 221, 246, 248, 286 f., 289, 309, 326, 415
 Robin's pincushion, I, 145
 Robinson, E. A., I, 63, II, 248
 Robinson, G. G. and J., II, 40
 Robinson, H. C., II, 346, 349, 358
 Robinson, Mary ("Perdita"), II, 344
 Robinson, Terese, II, 385

- Robson, Simon, I, 49
 Roe, J. E., II, 55 n., 215, 275
 Roedder, Paul, I, 35 f., II, 82, 147, 172, 231, 252, 265
 Roffe, Alfred, II, 323 f.
 Roger-Cornaz, F., II, 391
 Rogers, Samuel, II, 343, 358
 Rohde, Eleanor S., I, 247
 Rolfe, W. J., I, 16 f., 27, 29, 38, 59, 62, 79 f., 91, 101, 115 f., 139, 166, 170, 195, 199, 203, 227, 238, 250, 258 f., 278, 320, 322, 331, 388, II, 55, 72, 80, 97, 143, 203, 245, 263
 rolling, eye false in, I, 54, 58
 Rollins, H. E., I, 14, 64, 88, 99, 194, 218, 226, 256, 290, 330, II, 45, 56 n., 220 n., 307 n. *See* Shakespeare (William), *Poems*
Romeo and Juliet, I, 20 ff., 25, 27, 47, 61, 79, 88, 177, 218, 220, 236, 247, 256, 258, 268, 350, 356, 376, 385, 388, II, 39 n., 153, 189, 204, 248 n., 249, 327, 374; parallels with the sonnets, II, 63-66, 68
 Ronsard, Pierre de, I, 69, 128, 149, 249, 255, 307, 351, 394, 396, II, 125 ff., 255, 278, 412
 roof (=family), beauteous, I, 28 f.
 Roorbach, O. A., II, 372 n.
 Root, R. K., I, 143
 Rosaline, the dark woman, II, 249 n., 269
 rose, his, is true, I, 177 f.
 Rose, Sh.'s, I, 273 f., II, 329 f., 425; interpretations of, I, 7 f., II, 125, 157, 194, 203, 223, 243 f., 247, 374; italicized, II, 7, 8 f. n., 181
 Rose Theater, I, 7, 234
 Rosenbach, A. S. W., I, 261, II, 2, 5, 327 f., 348 n.
 roses, damasked, I, 333, 335; roses of shadow, I, 177 f.
 Rosicrucianism, the sonnets and, II, 107, 164, 216, 229
 Ross, George, I, 389, II, 362
 Ross, William, II, 46, 227, 260 n.
 Rossetti, D. G., I, 96, 225, II, 79, 142, 363 f., 420 f.
 Rossetti, W. M., I, 344, 348, II, 364
 rotten smoke, I, 98 f.
 Roumania, the sonnets in, II, 397
 roundure, huge, I, 60 f.
 Rowe, Nicholas, II, 29 f., 331 ff.
 Rowlands, Samuel, I, 370
 Rowley, William, I, 40
 Rowohlt, Ernst, II, 385
 Roxburghe, Duke of: *see* Ker (John)
 Royal Society of Literature, II, 216
 Roydon, Matthew, *Willobie* and, II, 307-311
 Rubel, Veré L., I, 377
 Rubow, P. V., II, 377, 396
 rude (=brutal), I, 329, 331
 ruinate, to, that beauteous roof, I, 28 f.
 ruined love, built anew, I, 300 f.
 ruins, Sh. on, I, 150
 run-on lines, Sh.'s, statistics about, II, 67. *See* endstopped
 Rupert, Prince, Duke of Cumberland, II, 182 n.
 Rusden, G. W., II, 152
 Rushton, W. L., I, 374
 Russell, Charles, II, 343
 Russell, G. W. ("A. E."), II, 238
 Russell, Matthew, II, 343
 Russell, Thomas, II, 344 f.
 Russell, Thomas, and Sh.'s will, II, 194 f., 206, 312
 Russia, the sonnets in, II, 398
 Rutland, Earl of: *see* Manners (Roger)
 Ruud, M. B., II, 377, 396
 Rye, W. B., I, 33
 Rylands, G. H. W., II, 161, 427 f.
 -s, plural verbs in, I, 53, 117, 236, 250, 281, 316. *See* plural
 's, possessive without, I, 61
 S., E. D., I, 376
 S., R., II, 333
 S., R. J. D., II, 223 f.
 S., W. (=Sh. or William Smith?), II, 53, 55
 S., W., *The Puritan*, II, 5
 S., W., *Willobie* and, II, 298, 302-313
 Sabeo, Fausto, I, 394
 Sachfield, Anne, II, 270. *See* Dave-nant
 Sachfield, William, II, 270
 Sachs, Dr., II, 72, 128, 143
 Sackville, Thomas, Baron Buckhurst, first Earl of Dorset, called "Mr.," II, 197
 sad, distempered guest, I, 391, 395; sad interim, this, I, 152, II, 181, 185
 sadly (=gravely), I, 23 f.

- Saenger, Eduard, II, 385
 sail, proud, full, I, 217. *See* proud
 St. Clair, F. Y., II, 69, 84 f.
 Saint Evremond, Charles de M. de
 S.-D., I, 113
 Saint-Gelais, Mellin de, I, 394
 St. Lys, Odette, I, 50, 293
 Saintsbury, George, I, 174, II, 151,
 187, 247, 365
 Salaman, C. K., II, 318
 Salesbury, William, I, 373
 Salisbury, Earl of: *see* Cecil (Robert)
 Salutati, Coluccio, II, 132
 salutation, give, to, I, 304 f.
 salve (=repentance), I, 98 f.
 Sampson, George, II, 176
 Sampson, John, I, 238
Samtiden, II, 396
 Sanderlin, George, II, 355
 Sandford, Hugh, II, 57
 Sandys, George, the friend (Bacon's),
 II, 229
 Sanfelice, Ettore, I, 263, II, 72, 124 n.,
 171, 190, 207, 233, 263 n., 281 n.,
 394
 Sanford, Ezekiel, II, 167, 353
 Sanger, E., II, 29
 Sangorski, Alberto, II, 3 n.
 Sanjurjo, Carmela Eulate, II, 397
 Sannazaro, Jacopo, II, 62, 127, 240 f.
 Santayana, George, I, 375
 Sanvitale, Leonora, II, 127 f.
 Sappho and Phaon, Q deals with, II,
 159
 Sargeant, Ezra, II, 36 n.
 Sarrazin, Gregor, I, 15, 54, 67 f., 95 f.,
 114, 121, 123, 170, 180, 204, 264,
 269, 280, 299 f., 314, 328, 347, 366
 f., 379, 395, II, 65 ff., 147 f., 177 f.,
 187 ff., 201 n., 205, 267, 269, 291,
 408
Sartain's Magazine, II, 86, 240, 257,
 372
 satire to decay, I, 248 f.
 satires, the sonnets as, II, 141, 252.
 See parodies
Saturday Review, I, 6, II, 54, 156, 164,
 191, 228 f., 264 f., 305
Saturday Review of Literature, II, 184
 Saturn, heavy, I, 241 f., II, 330
 saucy bark, my, I, 204 f., II, 249 n.,
 283 f.
 Sauguet, Henri, II, 318
 Savage, Walter, II, 29 n.
 Scaliger, J. C., II, 132
 scandal, vulgar, I, 283, II, 24, 148,
 255. *See* disgrace
 Scandinavia, the sonnets in, II, 396
 scansion, Sh.'s, I, 84, 141, II, 419-422.
 See enjambement; rhythm; rimes
 scanted all, I, 296
 scar, Sh.'s, over the left eye, I, 106
 scarlet ornaments, I, 363 f.
 Scève, Maurice, I, 13
 Schaible, K. H., II, 198
 Schallenberg, Christoph von, I, 393
 Scheffler, L. von, II, 382
 Scherr, Johannes, II, 72
 Schick, Joseph, I, 335
 Schiller, J. C. F. von, I, 96, II, 146,
 188
 Schiller, Julius, I, 281, II, 250
 Schirmer, W. F., I, 258, 375, II, 72,
 413 f.
 Schlegel, A. W. von, II, 133-136, 378,
 380 f.
 Schlegel, Friedrich von, II, 133 f.,
 136, 381
 Schlösser, Rudolf, II, 383
 Schmidt, Alexander, I, 8 f., 11 f., 15-
 22, 24, 26 ff., 30 f., 33, 37 ff., 42, 45 f.,
 48-51, 53, 57, 59, 61 f., 64, 66, *et*
 passim
 Schmidt, Wolfgang, I, 291, 355, II,
 51, 84, 152, 189 f. n., 194, 273
 Schneider, Karl, II, 45
 Schneider, R. S., II, 383
 Schoen-René, Otto, II, 376 n.
 School of Night, II, 284-288, 310 f.
 schoolmaster, Sh. a, I, 199
 schools, American, Sh. study in, II, 376
 Schrader, Hans, II, 379 f.
 Schrimpton, G., II, 317
 Schröder, R. A., II, 385 n.
 Schröer, M. M. A., II, 207
 Schück, Henrik, II, 396
 Schücking, L. L., II, 50 n., 172, 191,
 217 f., 265, 305 n.
 Schüddekopf, Carl, II, 380
 Schumacher, Andreas, II, 383
 Scoloker, Anthony, I, 23
 scope (=free play), I, 254; scope and
 tenor, I, 163 f.; that man's scope,
 I, 83 ff.
 score, tallies to, I, 307 f.
 Scott, Janet: *see* Espiner-Scott
 Scott, Walter, Sir, I, 105, II, 344 f.,
 354

- Scribner's Monthly*, I, 106, II, 375
Scrutiny, I, 264, 277, II, 43, 71, 108, 155, 278, 425
 sea, the, all water, I, 344, 348; sea terms, Sh.'s, I, 204 f., II, 174 (*see* nautical)
 seals up, I, 189, 191
 seat, forbear my, I, 116 ff.
 Seccombe, Thomas, II, 72, 95, 231, 407
 second burthen of a former child, I, 158 f.
 seconds, mixed with, I, 315, 317
 seeing, dead, I, 177 f.
 seeming, dead, I, 177 f.; seeming trust, I, 353, 355
 seething bath, I, 391, 394
 seldom pleasure, I, 140
Selecta epigrammata Graeca, I, 392
 self-doing crime, I, 156 f.
 self-example, by, I, 363, 365
 self-love, of his, I, 12 f.
 self-praise, Sh. on, I, 111. *See* boastfulness
 self-substantial fuel, I, 5, 8, II, 419
 sell, I purpose not to, I, 60, 62, II, 287 n.
 semicolon, sonnets ending with a, II, 78. *See* punctuation
 sense (plural), I, 227, 284
 sentence, sonnets in one, I, 41, 174, II, 422
 separable spite, I, 103 f.
 sequent toil, in, I, 160
 Sergeaunt, W. D., I, 215
 Servaes, Franz, I, 135
 sessions (=court of justice), I, 86 f., II, 422
 set me light, to, I, 221
 settled gravity, reasons of, I, 134 f.
 several plot, I, 351 f.
 Severn, Charles, I, 99
Sewanee Review, I, 63, 69, 246, II, 254
 Seward, Anna, II, 344
 Sewell, George, his editions of the sonnets, II, 29, 39, 75, 117, 243 f., 333 f., described, II, 30
 Seymour, Beatrice Keen, II, 376 n.
 Seymour, H., II, 229
 Shaaber, M. A., II, 219
 Shackford, Martha H., I, 7
 shade, death's, wand'rest in, I, 50 f.
 shadow (=figure of delight), I, 241, 243; (=imaginary image), I, 78 f.; roses of shadow, I, 178 f.; shadow and substance, I, 105, 108, II, 130, 159, 409; thy shadow makes shadows bright, I, 121 f.
 shadows like to thee, I, 163; strange shadows, I, 142, II, 184
 shady stealth, I, 198 f.
 Shahani, R. G., II, 399
 shake hands (=unite), I, 81
 Shake-speare, the hyphen in, II, 3
 Shakespeare, Anne Hathaway, Mrs., as the dark woman, II, 161, 227, as Octavia, II, 87, as the only begetter, II, 169; referred to, I, 117, 389, II, 135, 224, 248; sonnets addressed to, I, 231, II, 71, 86, 138, 159, 214, 256-260; "true story" of her life, I, 100. *See* Ann
 Shakespeare Association *Bulletin*, I, 20, 56, 59, 84, 334, 392, II, 43, 72, 126 n., 149, 156, 221, 369, 430
 Shakespeare, Edmund, the friend, II, 224
 Shakespeare, Edward, II, 224
 Shakespeare, Hamnet, addressed, II, 159, 177, 224, 257 ff.; his death, II, 224, referred to, I, 88
 Shakespeare, Jane, II, 238 n.
 Shakespeare, John, of London, II, 238 n.
 Shakespeare, John, of Stratford, II, 259; death of, referred to, I, 88
 Shakespeare, Judith, II, 257, 259, 266
 Shakespeare, Mary Arden, Mrs., II, 261, 266
 Shakespeare, Susanna: *see* Hall
Shakespeare Vocal Magazine, II, 315, 318 f.
 Shakespeare, William, as Mr. W. H., II, 44, 163 f., 214 ff., 224, as the rival poet, II, 226, 283, as the dark woman, II, 275 n.; author of the dedication, II, 175; his opinion of sonnets, I, 196 f., II, 171, 338, 384 (*see* poems); *Poems* (1938), ed. H. E. Rollins (*q. v.*), I, 70, 107, 163, 195, 246, 303, 350, 371, II, 4 n., 11, 16 n., 20 n., 21 n., 28, 29 n., 302 n., 307 n., 314, 327 n.; spelling of his name, II, 3. (For new light on Sh. the man *see, among others*, acting; Alice; hunch-back; illegitimate; illnesses; immorality; jewels; lame-

- ness; plays [Sh.'s]; poacher; scar; schoolmaster; sin; soldier; sonnets; stab; Stratford; style; suicide; "Swedenborgian"; travels)
- Shakespeare, William, the dummy, II, 46, 282
- Shakespeare, William, poet, playwright (*not* of Stratford), II, 44
- Shakespeare, William, son of Lord Oxford, II, 46, 282
- Shakespeare's England*, I, 69 f., 79, 141, 190, 205, 370
- Shakespeareana*, I, 66, 157, 220, II, 261, 318
- Shanks, Edward, II, 103
- shape, her husband's, I, 26; shape so true, I, 165 f.
- Sharp, William, I, 30, 39, 41, 91, 112, 173, 242, 304 f., 331, 374, II, 170, 198, 285, 364
- Shatford, Sarah, II, 52, 239, 374 n.
- Shaw, A. C., II, 377
- Shaw, Bernard, I, 138 f., 331, 334, II, 204, 251, 262, 265, 270
- Shaxpere, William, Anne Whateley and, II, 46, 227 f.
- she (noun), I, 335
- sheeds, I, 98 f.
- Shelley, P. B., I, 279, 281, II, 157, 256, 351, 363
- Shepherd, R. H., II, 364
- Sherwin, publisher, II, 355
- Sherwood, music publisher, II, 319
- Sherzer, Jane, II, 34, 40
- shewers (spelling), II, 15
- Shillan, David, I, 375
- Shimazaki, Toson, II, 398
- Shindler, Robert, I, 181 f., 277, 322, 371, 387, II, 6, 47, 93, 143 f., 198, 364
- Shirley, Anthony, author of *Q*, II, 45
- Shirley, James, I, 199
- shore, parts the, I, 152 f.
- Shore, W. T., II, 225, 260
- Shorey, Paul, II, 158
- short-hand, sonnets in, II, 384
- short-numbered hours, I, 311, 313
- show (=appearance), I, 17 f.; (intransitive), I, 257 f.; show thee me, dreams, I, 121 f.
- showers, sweet-seasoned, I, 194
- sick of welfare, I, 298 f.
- sickle, hour, time's, I, 319 ff.
- sickle's compass, bending, I, 293, 295
- side (=assign to one of two parties), I, 127 ff.
- Sidebotham, Herbert, I, 50
- Sidney, Philip, Sir, *alias* Sh., II, 44 f., 182, 229 f., 273; borrowings from, by Sh., I, 6 f., 18, 39, 47, 64, 78, 90, 121, 136, 298, 323, 329 f., 338, 356, 363, 375, 377, II, 62 f., discussed, II, 118-121, 124; cited or mentioned, I, 13, 45, 79, 114, 149, 197, 213, 215, 258, 282, 347, 357, 371, 379, II, 70, 75, 197, 253 ff., 274, 284, 327, 370, 400, 412, 419, 430 f.; Drayton imitates, II, 122 f.; the friend (of Bacon), II, 229, 275; on Raleigh, the author of *Q*, II, 273
- Sidney, Robert, Sir, II, 205
- siege, wrackful, I, 172 f.
- Sieper, Ernst, I, 335, II, 72, 147, 191
- Sievers, E. W., I, 296, II, 140, 188, 233
- Sievers, Eduard, II, 48 f., 173 n., 232
- sigh the lack, I, 86 f.
- sighing prejudicial to health, I, 88
- sight (=sigh), I, 88; conquest of thy sight, I, 127 f.; many a vanished sight, I, 86, 88; stand against thy sight, I, 109
- sightless view, I, 25, 78
- silvered o'er, I, 32 f., II, 329
- Simon, H. W., II, 368 f., 374, 376
- simplicity, truth miscalled, I, 174, 176
- simply, I credit, I, 353, 355
- Simpson, C. M., Jr., II, 314 n., 376 n.
- Simpson, H. B., II, 3 n.
- Simpson, Percy, I, 93; on Sh.'s punctuation (*q. v.*), I, 13, 34, 72, 85, 186, 212, 218, 239, 382, 388, II, 17
- Simpson, Richard, I, 22, 45, 70, 267, II, 6, 144 f.; music (*q. v.*) by, for the sonnets, II, 314 ff., 318-321, 323; on Sh.'s Platonism, I, 6, 286, II, 78, 131, 157 f., 233, 272 (*see* Plato)
- Simrock, K. J., II, 188, 250, 383
- sin, Sh.'s idea of, II, 423. *See* immorality
- sincerity, the, of Sh.'s sonnets, II, 241. *See* autobiography
- single one, name of, I, 111; thou single wilt prove none, I, 23, 25
- siren tears, I, 300, II, 9 n., 428
- Sisson, C. J., I, 92, 149, 185, II, 254, 291

- sit in my verse, I, 254
 Skeat, W. W., I, 155
 skill, warrantise of, I, 385
 Skinker, Tannakin, II, 56 n.
 Skinner, B. F., I, 86 f.
 Skinner, Cornelia Otis, II, 376 n.
 Skipwith, G. H., I, 7, 316, II, 185
 Skottowe, Augustine, II, 134, 269
 sky, self-same, I, 41 f.
 Slater, Gilbert, II, 293
 slavery, slave to, I, 340
 sleep, death and, I, 190 f.
 slept, I have, in your report, I, 210 f.
 slight air, I, 125; slight muse, I, 109
 slow offense, I, 137
 sluttish time, I, 147, 150
 Smeaton, Oliphant, II, 147, 266
 Smedley, W. T., II, 229
 Smith, —, Lady, the dark woman, II, 268
 Smith, C. A., I, 117
 Smith, Charlotte, II, 339, 344 ff., 368
 Smith, G. C. M., I, 137 f., 184, 234, 237, II, 60
 Smith, J. R., II, 3 n., 5
 Smith, L. P., II, 149
 Smith, Lucy Toulmin, II, 302 n., 303
 Smith, Thomas, Sir, II, 268
 Smith, W. C., II, 314
 Smith, W. G., on proverbs (*q. v.*), I, 348
 Smith, William, *Chloris*, I, 319, II, 53, 55, 305, 431
 smoke, rotten, I, 98 f.
 Snagg, R., II, 336
 Snider, D. J., II, 216, 245 f., 282
 so (=provided that), I, 184, 343
 Socrates, II, 131, 233
 soil (=a blemish), I, 182; firm soil, the ocean wins the, I, 169 ff.
 soldier, Sh. a, I, 106
 sole, the, I, 182; sole effect, love's, I, 103 f.
 soliloquies, the sonnets Bacon's, II, 164
 Solomon's bride, the dark woman, II, 157, 272
 solve, the, I, 182
 sonnet, meaning of the word, I, 319; sonnets on the, II, 370
 sonnets, approaches to, in Sh.'s plays, I, 293 f., II, 66, 69; vogue of, I, 197, II, 22 n., 69, 237, 326-399; written to order by Bacon, II, 164, by Sh., II, 94, 110, 135, 137 f., 141 f., 151, 160, 222, 241, 246, 250, 260 f., 290
 Sophocles, I, 13, II, 131
 Soranzo, Antonio, II, 128
 sorrows, Sh.'s, II, 251 f., 254, 414 ff., 423. *See* melancholy
 soundless deep, I, 204, II, 290
 "sources" of the sonnets, II, 117-132
 sourly leave her, will, I, 116 f.; sourly robs, I, 100, 102
 Southampton, Countesses and Earls of: *see* Wriothesley
Southern Literary Messenger, II, 244, 370
Southern Review (Baton Rouge), I, 311, 314, II, 377, 436
Southern Review (Charleston), II, 369
 Southey, Robert, II, 345 f.
 Southwell, Robert, S. J., I, 66, 264, II, 216 f.; as the friend, II, 224 f.
 sovereign, my, I, 154 f.
 spacious (pronunciation), I, 344, 347
 Spain, Sh.'s references to, I, 263 ff., 267, II, 58 (*see* Cadiz; Spanish); the sonnets in, II, 396 f.
 Spalding, T. A., I, 104, II, 79, 142, 363
 Spanish proverbs, I, 200, 278. *See* Spain
 Speaight, Robert, II, 376 n.
 speaking in effect, I, 214, 216
Spectator, II, 140, 287 n.
 Spedding, James, I, 96, 331
 speechless song, I, 23, 25
 speed, winged, in, I, 137 f.
 Speght, Thomas, II, 292
 spelling, Sh.'s, discussed, II, 15-18; notes on, I, 117, 155, 185 f., 218, 249, II, 6, 9
 Spence, R. M., I, 160, 162, 374
 Spencer, G. J., second Earl Spencer, II, 2
 Spencer, Hazelton, II, 11, 112, 156, 206, 232, 239, 313, 435
 Spencer, Theodore, I, 186, 192
 Spenser, Edmund, borrowings from, by Sh., I, 147, 185, 245, 261, 270, II, 117, 131, 334, 349, 381; cited or mentioned, I, 41, 52, 58, 61, 66, 76, 108, 117, 127, 146, 149, 174, 201 f., 215, 258, 276, 282, 321, 334 f., 377 f., II, 45, 62, 249, 287, 290, 344, 348, 357, 362, 370 f., 400,

- 413, 419, 428, 430 f.; *Faery Queen*, written by Anne Whateley, II, 46; poet laureate, II, 280; the rival poet, II, 279, 281 ff., 287, 291; sonnets to, II, 178
- Spenser Society Publications, II, 301 n.
- Spielmann, M. H., II, 150
- spies, frailer, I, 304 f.
- Spira, Theodor, I, 175
- spirit, better, I, 204, II, 278 f., 284, 288 f.; expense of spirit, I, 329, 331; Sh.'s spirit, W. H. as, II, 228 (*see* ghost); that able spirit, I, 214, 216, II, 288 f.
- Spirit of the Farmers' Museum*, II, 368
- spiritual, Sh.'s sonnets, not Christian, I, 375
- spite of fortune, I, 225; fortune's dearest spite, I, 105, 107; separable spite, I, 103 f., II, 292
- spondaic lines in the sonnets, I, 18
- sport, gentle, thy fault, I, 237; lascivious comments on thy sport, I, 236
- sportive blood, I, 304 f. (cf. 280, 347), II, 255
- Sprague, H. B., I, 293
- spring, Sh. on the, II, 211 f.
- Spring, L. W., II, 264
- springs, hot, sonnets on, I, 391-397
- Spurgeon, Caroline F. E., I, 32, 299, 317, 375 f., II, 351
- Squire, J. C., Sir, II, 27, 410
- stab, an attempt to, Sh., I, 193
- stage, the, censorship of, Sh. on, I, 176; huge stage (=the earth), I, 41 f.; Sh.'s attitude to, I, 275 f., II, 381; sonnets defending, II, 159. *See* acting
- stain (=grow dim), I, 95, 97, 100, II, 62, 420
- stained, preposterously, I, 273 f.
- Stainer, C. L., II, 51
- Stalker, Archibald, I, 59, 320, 346, II, 51 f., 190 n., 288, 366
- stamp, some fresher, I, 208 f.
- stand against thy sight, to, I, 109
- Standen, Gilbert, II, 107
- Stanford University, *Abstracts*, II, 26 n., 27; *Studies*, II, 62, 297 n., 309 n.
- Stanley, Ferdinando, fifth Earl of Derby, part-author of Q, II, 47
- Stanley, H. M., II, 234
- Stanley, William, sixth Earl of Derby, II, 310; *alias* Sh., II, 45, 165, 313 n.
- Stansby, William, II, 301
- Stanyhurst, Richard, II, 278
- star, that full, I, 338 f.; star to every bark, I, 293, 295
- stars, the, comment, I, 41 f., II, 434
- starved, clean, for a look, I, 194 f.
- state, all thy, strength of, I, 237 f.; child of, I, 311 f.; interchange of, I, 169, 171
- Stationers' Company Register, I, 170, 235, II, 1, 3, 19 f., 23, 29 n., 53, 55, 63, 73, 290 n., 295, 301, 327
- statute of thy beauty, I, 342 f.
- Stauffer, D. A., I, 376
- Staunton, Howard, I, 23, 60, 65, 73, 83, 100, 113, 159, 168, 174, 177, 183 f., 194, 206, 210, 212, 227, 233, 239, 273, 296, 302, 311, 315 f., 325, 345, 361, 363, 381, 388, II, 6, 139, 167, 197, 230, 293, 361
- stay, this inconstant, I, 41 f.
- stealth, shady, I, 198 f.
- steel, gates of, I, 172 f.
- Steel, James, II, 355
- steeled sense, my, I, 283 f.
- steep-up hill, I, 21
- steepy night, age's, I, 167 f.
- Steevens, George, I, 13, 15, 17, 28, 33, 40, 43, 46, 51, 53, 59, 62, 64, *et passim*, II, 2, 5, 26 n., 38 f., 53 n., 75 f., 177, 242, 248, 335, 368, 378; condemns the sonnets, I, 55, 74, 86, 284, 366, II, 133, 336-339, 346, 377, 380, 387, and therefor is applauded, II, 343 f., 347 ff., 359 f., 366, and censured, I, 83, II, 349 n., 350, 352-357, 359-363, 365, 372 f., 375, 379, 386, 393
- Steeves, H. R., II, 40, 375
- Steinmann, Ernst, II, 385
- stell'd, my eye hath, I, 69 f.
- Stengel, Edmund, I, 44, 69, 147, 158, 206, 263, II, 80, 91, 142, 145
- Stephens, John, I, 70
- stern wolf, I, 237 f.
- Sterner, L. G., II, 367 f.
- Steuerwald, Wilhelm, I, 196, II, 142
- stewards of their excellence, I, 233 f.
- Stewart, C. J., II, 222
- stick'st (=hesitates), I, 28
- Stigel, Johann, I, 394

- still (=always), I, 26, 256, 321
 stirred (=inspired), I, 60 f.
 Stockdale, Percival, II, 348 f.
 Stockwell, La Tourette, II, 335 n.
 Stoddard, R. H., II, 375
 stoicism, doctrine of, Sh. and the, I, 375. *See* philosophy
 Stokes, F. G., II, 154
 Stoll, E. E., I, 87, 253
 Stols, A. A. M., II, 395 n.
 stone, unswept, I, 147, 150
 Stone, E. D., I, 50
 Stopes, C. C., Mrs., I, 10, 26, 52, 57, 68, 138, 148, 183, 188, 229 f., 232, 254, 264, 295, 327, 354, 358, 364, 367, 372, 374, 377, 388, 391 f., II, 56 f., 72, 96 f., 130, 175, 182, 191, 197 f., 202, 204, 208, 212 f., 220 ff., 238 n., 262 n., 263, 268, 277, 304, 306, 310
 store, loss with, I, 169 ff.; made for store, I, 30 f.; thy store, aggravate, I, 374, 378
 stores' account, thy, I, 349 f.; him she stores, I, 177 f.
 storm-beaten face, I, 98, 166
 Stotsenburg, J. H., II, 44 f., 182, 229 f., 273
 Strachey, Charles, I, 215, II, 226, 265
 Strachey, J. St. L., I, 268
 Strachey, Lytton, II, 161
 Strafforello, Gustavo, I, 333 f., II, 170, 198, 393
 strained touches, I, 208 f., II, 122, 277
 strains of woe, other, I, 225 f.
 strange, look, I, 223 f.; strange shadows, I, 142
 strangely, askance and, I, 275, 277; strangely pass, I, 134
 strangle, acquaintance, I, 223 f.
 Stratford, publication of Q drives Sh. to, II, 149, and compromises him, II, 219; Sh.'s grave in, I, 207; Sh.'s trips to, I, 78, 392, II, 259; sonnets written in, II, 257
 Strathmann, E. A., II, 310 n.
 stretched meter, I, 48 f., 209, II, 351, 419
 Stricker, Käthe, II, 155
 Stringer, Philip, II, 192
 Strode, William, II, 20, 225
 Stronach, George, II, 47, 283, 290 f.
 Strong, J. R., II, 266
 Stroup, T. B., I, 293
 Strout, A. L., II, 134 n.
 structure of the sonnets, comments on, I, 89, 100, 116, 134, 167, 174, 190, 206, 274, 291, 294, 311, 330 f., 376, 387, II, 118, 341, 343, 347, 351, 365, 391 f., 400, 403 f., 406 ff., 412 ff., 417 f., 425, 427-432, 435, *et passim*. *See* Petrarch
 Stuart, Ludovick, second Duke of Lennox, I, 7, 27
 Studien zur vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte, II, 383
 Studies in Philology, I, 70, 90, 261, 264, 272, 377 f., 396, II, 17 n., 67, 83, 118, 121, 289
 Sturm, Julius, II, 384
 style, literary, Sh.'s comments on, I, 60 ff., 196 f., 214 f., 217, 333 f.; Sh.'s mannerisms of, II, 68, 155, 418. *See, among others*, chiasmus; ellipses; euphuism; hendiadys; imagery; monosyllables; O; oxymoron; plays on words; repetition; rimes
 style, printer's, Sh. and inconsistencies in, II, 4, 8, 16 f.
 subdued to, I, 279, 281, II, 426
 subjunctive mood, archaic use of the, I, 11
 suborned informer, I, 315, 317 f., II, 265, 274
 subscribes, death to me, I, 263, 270
 substance, what is your, I, 142
 successive heir, beauty's, I, 323 f.
 such . . . that (construction), I, 99
 Suckling, John, Sir, I, 26 f., 130, 140, 145, 247, 256, 358, II, 329
 Suddard, Sarah J. Mary, I, 159
 sufferance, tame to, I, 156 f.
 sufficed (=satisfied), I, 105, 108
 sugared sonnets, Sh.'s, II, 53 f., 62, 141, 151, 328
 suggest (=tempt), I, 368, 370 (cf. II, 15)
 suicide, Sh. meditates, I, 193
 suit thy pity, I, 338 f.
 suited, eyes so, I, 323 ff.
 Sulkowska, Marya, II, 398
 sullen earth, I, 83, 85
 Sullivan, Edward, I, 184
 sum, cast his utmost, I, 134; sum my count, I, 10 f.
 summer's story, any, I, 241 f.

- sun, course of the, life compared to, I, 21; five hundred courses of the sun, I, 158 f.; men honor the rising, not the setting, sun, I, 22; my sun, one early morn, I, 95, II, 224, 230, 268; that sun, thine eye, I, 134 f.
- sun-dial, portable, Sh.'s gift of a, I, 199 f.
- superlatives, *-est* in double, I, 205
- suppose your affairs, I, 154 f.
- suppressed, the sonnets, II, 49, 326 f.
See banned
- surfeit, pine and, I, 194 f.
- surmise accumulate, I, 296 f.
- Surrey, Earl of: *see* Howard (Henry)
- suspect (=suspicion), I, 183 ff.
- Swan, M. W. S., II, 35
- swart-complexioned night, I, 81 f.
- Swarth, Helene, II, 395 n.
- sway, by limping, I, 174, 176; sway with insufficiency, I, 385
- swayest (=manages), I, 326 f.
- Sweden, the sonnets in, II, 396
- "Swedenborgian," Sh. a, II, 374
- sweet boy, I, 271, II, 110, 163, 200, 206 f., 210; sweet favor, most, I, 286 f.; sweet love, I, 203, II, 249 n.
- sweets with sweets, I, 23 f.
- sweet-seasoned showers, I, 194
- swerving (=returning), I, 219 f.
- swift extremity, I, 137
- Swift, Jonathan, II, 308
- Swinburne, A. C., I, 106, 235, 367, II, 142, 302 n., 362 f., 367
- Swinesnout, Lady, the dark woman, II, 56, 267 n.
- sycophancy, Sh.'s, II, 366
- Sylvester, Joshua, II, 278
- Symmons, Charles, II, 348
- Symonds, Emily M. ("George Paston"), II, 244 f. n.
- Symonds, J. A., I, 331, II, 143, 158, 364
- Symons, A. J. A., II, 184
- sympathized, truly, I, 208 f., II, 162
- symphony, the sonnets as a, II, 83
- syphilis, Sh. diseased with, II, 258 n. (cf. I, 371). *See* illnesses; venereal
- Szabó, Lőrinc, II, 397
- Szasz, Károly, Jr., II, 397
- T., J., II, 344
- T. P.'s *Weekly*, II, 338 n.
- T., R., II, 289
- T., T.: *see* Thorpe
- table of my heart, in, I, 69 f. (cf. II, 126); table-book, sonnet on a, I, 198 ff.
- tables, thy gift, I, 307
- Taine, H. A., II, 244, 403 f.
- Talbot, Mary: *see* Herbert
- talents, parable of the, I, 16
- tall building, of, I, 204 f.
- tallies to score, I, 307 f.
- tame, patience, to sufferance, I, 156 f., II, 17
- Taming of the Shrew*, I, 50, 138, 339, II, 251, 319, 322, 324; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64
- tan sacred beauty, I, 291 f.
- tanned antiquity, I, 165 f., II, 48, 200, 426, 428
- Tannenbaum, S. A., I, 54, 56 f., 59, 181, II, 17, 112, 185, 270, 308, 314-318, 320, 322 ff., 366 n., 367, 376 n., 390 n., 397, 399
- Tasso, Bernardo, II, 62, 241, 254
- Tasso, Ercole, II, 289 f. n.
- Tasso, Torquato, I, 83, 187, II, 127 f., 240, 254, 292, 342, 392; the rival poet, II, 289 f.
- taste, by wilful, I, 113, 115, 119
- tasters, princes', I, 290
- Tatler*, II, 37 n.
- Tatlock, J. S. P., I, 377
- Tauchnitz Pocket Library, II, 385
- Tausig, Paul, I, 393
- Taylor, —, conjecture by, I, 121
- Taylor, G. A., II, 225, 262 f. n.
- Taylor, H. O., II, 235, 410 f.
- Taylor, Henry, Sir, II, 142
- Taylor, Madeleine P., II, 316
- tears, heavy, I, 123 f.
- teeming autumn, I, 239 f.
- tell (=count), I, 86, 88; tell my name, every word doth, I, 196 f., II, 51, 192
- temperate, lovely and more, I, 50
- Tempest*, I, 33, 275, 289, II, 251, 315, 317 ff., 411; parallels with the sonnets, II, 65, 70
- ten for one, I, 19 f.
- tend, shadows on you, I, 142; tend upon the hours, I, 154
- tender (=immature), I, 5, 8; barren tender, I, 210
- Tennyson, Alfred, first Baron Tennyson, I, 117, 235, II, 364, 427

- Tennyson, Frederick, II, 343
 Tennyson, Hallam, II, 364
 tenth muse, I, 109, II, 246, 292
 tenure, scope and, I, 163 f. (cf. II, 18 n.)
 Ter Haghe, Adolf, II, 226, 237
 Terence, I, 386
 term of life, for, I, 229
 terms divine, buy, I, 374, 378
 testy sick men, I, 358
 tetrameters, sonnet in, I, 372, II, 129.
 See irregular
 Texas, University of, *Studies in English*, I, 50
 -*th*, plural verb in, I, 112, 283, 310;
 softening of *th*, I, 185 (*see* pronunciation)
 Thaler, Alwin, I, 215, 339
 that (conjunctive use), I, 42; (=so that), I, 7, 221; (=that it), I, 230; (=what), I, 73; (=when), I, 151; that having (=qua habente), I, 254
 theaters, London, closed in 1593, I, 65, in 1596, I, 305, in 1600, I, 313; ordered pulled down, I, 176. *See* acting
 Theatre, II, 202 n., 211, 264
 thee myself, I, 165 f.
 their, misprint for *thy*, I, 75, 77 ff., 100 f., 107, 121 f., 125-129, 181, 183 f., 326, 328, II, 7 f., 96, 99. *See* misprints
 Thelwall, John, II, 346
 thematic a priori of Q, II, 84
 themselves, die to, I, 144 f.
 Theobald, B. G., II, 107, 109
 Theobald, Lewis, I, 73 f., 172 f., 198, 200, 298, II, 31 n., 331; his proposed edition of Sh.'s poems, II, 30, 334
 Theobald, R. M., II, 223, 278
 Theobald, William, I, 371, II, 44, 229 f.
 there, misprint for *thee*, I, 91. *See* misprints
 Thesaurus Poeticus, II, 329
 thether (spelling), II, 15
 thief, gentle, I, 113, 115; sweet thief, I, 25, 100, 102, 244
 thievish progress, I, 198, 200
 Thiselton, A. E., I, 8, 374
 Thoms, W. J., I, 106
 Thomson, Walter, I, 58, II, 51, 185
 Thomson, William, II, 163
 Thorndike, A. H., II, 40, 68, 152, 177 f., 231, 251, 375
 Thorn-Drury, George, I, 150, II, 329 f.
 thorns, fearfully on, I, 244, 247
 Thornton, Gregory, II, 149 f., 235 f.
 Thorpe, Thomas (T. T.), I, 238, 322, II, 1, 3, 5, 10, 16 ff., *et passim*; alias Menas, II, 87, and Thomas Hariot, II, 229; a dedication of, to Pembroke, II, 200; dedication of Q by, II, 151, discussed, II, 166-176, and inspired by Anne Whateley, II, 227 f.; edition of Q by, described, II, 1-18, and later history of, II, 36-41; meaning of his initials, II, 174 f.; William Hall and, II, 216-219; William Hervey and, II, 220 f.
 thou (accusative), I, 274
 thou and you, interchange of, discussed, I, 35 ff., 71, 256, 373, II, 50, 79 f., 91, 95, 104 f., 159, 224
 thought (=imagination), I, 123 f.; (=melancholy), I, 111 f., 124; (=resolution), I, 28 f.; thought *vs.* space, I, 123 f.
 thoughts, their, add weeds to, I, 181 f.
 thousand errors, I, 360, II, 243 n.
 thrall'd discontent, I, 311 ff.
 three winters cold, I, 255 f. (cf. II, 159)
 three years, conventional period of time, I, 255 f., II, 61 f., 241
 thriftless (=unprofitable), I, 10 f.
 thrivers, pitiful, I, 315, 317
 Thurston, Herbert, II, 43 n., 206, 217 f., 236 f.
 Tibullus, Albius, I, 186, II, 132
 Tieck, Dorothea, II, 383
 Tieck, Ludwig, II, 53, 85, 87, 134 f., 186 f., 249, 378, 380, 383
 Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche . . . Letterkunde, II, 395
 Tilley, M. P., on proverbs (*q. v.*), I, 64, 120, 256
 Tillotson, Kathleen, I, 206, 268, 370, II, 121, 123
 Tilskueren, II, 396 n.
 Time, or Mutability, Sh. on, I, 41, 103, 150, 159-162, 169, 193, 248, II, 162 f., 273, 413, 418, 427, 434; Bruno on, II, 129; the word not used in 127-154, I, 52 f., 150; Time

- debateth with decay, I, 41 f.; devouring Time, I, 52; fools of Time, I, 311, 313 f.; Time a grave-digger, I, 161; never-resting Time, I, 17; reckoning Time, I, 291 f.; sluttish Time, I, 147, 150; time to come, in, I, 48; tyrant Time, bloody, I, 44; wasted time, I, 260 f.; wastes of Time, I, 32 f., II, 351; wooed of Time, I, 183 f.
- time-bettering days, I, 208 f.
- Time's best jewel, I, 172 f.; Time's chest, I, 172 f.; Time's fickle glass, I, 319 ff.; Time's fool, I, 293, 295, II, 162; Time's pencil, I, 44, 46 f.; Time's pyramids, I, 309; Time's scythe, I, 32, 34, 160 ff., 168, 248 f., 295, 309, 319 ff.; Time's thievish progress, I, 198, 200; time's waste, dear, I, 86 f.
- Time's Telescope*, I, 241
- times (=generations) should cease, I, 30 f.; times in hope, I, 160, 162
- Times*, *The* (London), II, 327
- Times Literary Supplement*, I, 7, 36, 51, 71, 82, 93, 124, 165, 199, 214 f., 237 f., 256, 258, 264 f., 267, 276 f., 282, 316, 359, 383, II, 2, 3 n., 19 n., 44, 51, 60 f., 105, 112, 125, 149 f., 184 f., 194, 218, 225 ff., 229, 265, 268 n., 271, 273, 280 f., 288, 309, 327
- Timon of Athens*, I, 22, 157, 190, II, 45; parallels with the sonnets, II, 65, 70
- tincture, perfumed, I, 144 f.
- tires, Grecian, I, 142 f.
- Tirinelli, Gustavo, II, 144 n., 393
- ti's, I, 69 f.
- 'tis so, I, 214, 216, II, 290
- Tite, William, Sir, II, 2
- title, happy, I, 229 f.
- title-page of Q, its cipher, II, 229; its significance, II, 3, 49
- titles of books, the sonnets used for, II, 366, 376 n. (*see* fiction); titles for the sonnets, Benson's, II, 20 ff., 24, 74, 133, 328, 379, and Poole's, II, 329
- Titus Andronicus*, I, 11, 79, 91, 117, 326, II, 415; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64
- to (=as to), I, 185; (=in comparison with), I, 132
- tobacco, the dark woman and, II, 243; Sh., Pembroke, and, II, 202, 204
- Tofte, Robert, II, 431
- toil, weary with, I, 78
- Tokyo University, *Studies in English Literature*, I, 233, II, 232 n.
- told (=counted), I, 353, 355
- Tolnai, Vilmos, II, 397
- Tolomei, Claudio, I, 393, II, 326 n.
- tomb, bring a, I, 210 f.; gilded tomb, I, 250 f.; tomb to stop posterity, I, 12 f.; womb, making the, their tomb, I, 217 f.
- tombs, brasswork on, I, 170; trophies on, I, 91; tombs of brass, I, 263, 270
- tongue, less truth than, I, 48 f.
- tongues, lack, to praise, I, 260; tongues, the voice of souls, I, 181, II, 287
- tongue-tied, art made, I, 174, 176; makes me, I, 204; tongue-tied muse, I, 214; tongue-tied patience, I, 358
- Tonson, Jacob, II, 29
- took, league is, I, 130; must from you be, I, 194 f.
- Torrence, Ernest, II, 316
- Toscano, Matteo, I, 394
- Tottel's Miscellany*, I, 64, 99, 194, 319, 330, II, 75, 335. *See* Howard (Henry); Wyatt
- tottered loving, I, 75, 77; tottered weed, I, 10 f. (cf. II, 15)
- touches, base, prone to, I, 360 f.; heavenly, I, 48 f.; strained, I, 208 f., II, 122
- "Touchstone," II, 228
- Towndrow, R. F., I, 145
- Toyoda, Minoru, II, 398 f.
- tract, converted from his, I, 21 f.
- traffic (=dealings), I, 15 f.
- Tragedy, the dark woman as, II, 274
- transfix the flourish, I, 160 f.
- translated, to truths, I, 237 f.
- Traubel, Horace, II, 375
- traveling, sonnets about, I, 77 f., 81, 98, 132, 136 f., 239 f., II, 188 f., 202, 258, 259 n.
- travels, Sh.'s, on the Continent, I, 95, 123, 136, 170, 395, II, 267. *See* absence
- Travers, S. S., II, 224
- Traversi, D. A., I, 52, 103, 206, 355

- treasure (=enrich), I, 19; treasure of thy days, I, 10, II, 243 n.
- Tree, Ann Maria, II, 317
- Trelawny, E. J., II, 157
- Trench, R. C., Archbishop, I, 330, II, 343, 406
- trenches (=wrinkles), I, 10 f., II, 329
- Trentham, Elizabeth: *see* Vere (de)
- Trentham, Thomas, dedicates Q, II, 175
- Trevelyan, W. C., II, 302 f.
- trim, in all his, I, 241, II, 330
- "trislegomena," Sh.'s, II, 65
- triumphant prize, I, 387 f.
- Troilus and Cressida*, I, 93, 103, 150, 179, 204, 277, 284, 303, II, 45, 265, 273, 326 n., 426; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64
- trophies, hung with, I, 90 f. (cf. II, 15)
- Trotman, J. W., II, 224 f.
- truant muse, I, 250
- true plain words, I, 208 f., II, 127, 162
- truest bars, I, 132
- truly sympathized, I, 208 f.
- Trunz, Erich, I, 273
- Trussell, John, II, 327 f.
- truth (=fidelity), I, 144, 277; beauty and truth, I, 39 f., 250 (cf. II, 162 f.); made of truth, I, 353, 355; nature's truth, rarities of, I, 160, 162; of less truth than tongue, I, 48 f.; truth proves thievish, I, 132 f.; two-fold truth, I, 116, 118
- Tschischwitz, Benno, I, 218, 283, 287, 303, II, 383
- Tsubouchi, Yuzo, II, 398
- Tucker, T. G., I, 8 f., 11, 13 f., 16, 18 f., 22, 24, 26, 29, 31, 33 f., 36, 38, 42, 44, 51 f., 57, 59-62, 64, 66 f., *et passim*, II, 10, 27, 48, 125, 154, 205 f., 246, 252, 266, 395
- tune, tongue's, I, 360 f.
- Turberville, George, I, 334, 390, II, 141
- Turkey, Lepanto and, I, 263
- Turmann, Margaritha, I, 334
- Turner, C. E., II, 343, 398
- Turner, Clifford, II, 376 n.
- twain (=separated), I, 103; both twain, I, 119 f.; make one twain, I, 111 f.
- Twelfth Night*, I, 11, 31, 64, 125, 261, 290, 348, II, 187, 265, 317 f.; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64, 66
- twilight of such day, I, 189 f.
- twire, I, 81 f.
- Two Gentlemen of Verona*, I, 28, 157, 185, 190, 301, II, 258, 265, 316 f., 319-322; parallels with the sonnets, II, 64 f., 69, 71
- Tyler, Royall, II, 367
- Tyler, Thomas, I, 11 ff., 15, 18, 23, 26, 33, 37 f., 42, 44, 48, 58, 61, 66, *et passim*, II, 58 f., 80, 98, 121, 122 n., 129 f., 175, 285, 394; on Pembroke and Fitton, II, 189, 198 f., 200 n., 201-206, 208 ff., 222, 262-266, 270
- tyrannous (=cruel), I, 336
- tyrant, all, I, 383 f.
- Tyrwhitt, Thomas, I, 116, 152, 181, 260, 262, 275, II, 180 f.
- ugly sweethearts, convention of, I, 334
- Ulrici, Hermann, II, 77, 137, 142, 159 n., 187, 196, 363, 401 f.
- umbræ idearum*, II, 130
- unauthorized, the text of Q, discussed, II, 1-18; other comments on, I, 238, 322, II, 47, 49, 75, 93, 176, 192 f., 216, 294, 359, *et passim*. *See* authenticity; manuscript of Q; misprints; proofreading
- unbless some mother, I, 12
- under eye, each, I, 21
- Underhill, William, II, 216
- uneared womb, I, 12 f., II, 366
- unfair (verb), I, 17
- unfathered, be, I, 311 f.; unfathered fruit, I, 239 f.
- "ung par tout, tout par ung," motto, II, 188
- Ungarische Rundschau*, I, 393
- unhappily (=evilly), I, 174 f.
- unions married, by, I, 23 f., II, 329
- United States Magazine*, II, 370
- Universal Magazine*, II, 344
- unjust (=faithless), I, 353, 355
- unkind abuse, I, 342 f.
- unknown minds, I, 296 f., 299, II, 428
- unlooked for (=unexpectedly), I, 73; unlooked on, I, 21, II, 212 n.
- unperfect actor, I, 65 f.
- unprovident, I, 28, II, 422
- unrespected fade, I, 144 f.; view things unrespected, I, 121
- unstained prime, I, 183, 185, II, 15, 178

unswayed, leaves, I, 360 ff.
 unswept stone, I, 147, 150
 untainted (= uninjured), I, 52 f.
 Untermeyer, Louis, I, 50, II, 436 f.
 unthrift (noun), I, 26
 untold (= uncounted), I, 349 f.
 untrimmed (= divested of ornament),
 I, 50 f.
 untrue (= unworthy), I, 187; (noun),
 I, 287 f.
 untutored youth, I, 353
 Upham, A. H., II, 126
 uprear my hand, I, I, 134 f.
 "Urban, Sylvanus," II, 203, 217
 use (= interest), I, 19, 342 f.; (= in-
 vestment), I, 10 f.; (= occupy, use
 up), I, 15 f.; (i. e. sexual com-
 merce), I, 54, 59; got my use,
 I, 201, II, 277
 user, the, so destroys it, I, 26 f.
 usest, my love thou, I, 113 f.
 usury, forbidden, I, 19, II, 184
 Utley, Francis, I, 334
 Utterson, E. V., II, 2

 vade (= disappear), I, 144, 146
Valiant Welshman, I, 268
 Vallentin, Berthold, II, 235
 valley fountain, cold, I, 391, II, 157,
 422
 Van Dam, B. A. P., I, 374
 Vandiver, E. P., Jr., II, 369
 Van Doren, Mark, I, 186, II, 434 f.
 Van Dyck, Anthony, Sir, I, 207, II, 196
 variants in copies of Benson's edition,
 II, 19, 28, of Gentleman's edition,
 II, 31 f., 33 n., 336 n., of Q, I, 202,
 II, 5
 Vauquelin de la Fresnaie, Jean, I,
 255 f., II, 126
 Vautrollier, Jacqueline: *see* Field
 Vautrollier, Thomas, II, 130
 Vavasour, Anne, the dark woman, II,
 230, 276
 Vedia y Mitre, Mariano de, II, 397
 Veen, Octavio van, I, 7, 63
 Velasco y Rojas, D. Matías de, I,
 154, II, 396; rearranges Q, II, 91
 venereal disease, reference to, I, 371.
 See syphilis
 Vengerov, S. A., II, 398
 Venice, Italy, the dark woman from,
 II, 267, 272 n.; Sh. visits, I, 123,
 170. *See* Italy

Venus and Adonis, Barnfield quotes,
 II, 123; borrows from Chaucer, II,
 292; Chapman alludes to, II, 287 f.;
 Coleridge on, II, 349; composed by
 Bacon, II, 229, by Sh. to stimulate
 Southampton, II, 187 f., by "W.,"
 II, 50; the dark woman in, II, 249;
 the dated sonnet and, II, 60;
 earlier, II, 55 f., or later than Q,
 II, 70; editions of, by Gildon, II,
 29 f., Boston publishers, II, 35 f.,
 Lintott, II, 36 ff., and others, II,
 40, 335 f.; grammar notes on, I, 26,
 67, 117, 130, 173, 256, II, 15 n., 68;
 Griffin's borrowings from, II, 292;
 Lady Oxford in, II, 275; licensed
 by the archbishop, II, 192; Mar-
 lowe plagiarizes, II, 283; Mr. W. H.
 in, II, 219; mentioned, II, 186, 193,
 200 f., 211 f., 223, 268, 289, 313 n.,
 329, 331, 333, 360 f., 365 f., 369 f.,
 380, 383, 389, 402, 407, 413, 427;
 Meres on, II, 53, 328; metrics of,
 II, 67; omitted by Benson, II, 20;
 parallels with the sonnets cited, I,
 13, 22, 37, 44, 96, 101, 117, 125 f.,
 132 f., 159, 163, 195, 199, 216, 247,
 268, 273, 321, 330, 335, 361, 364,
 377, 394, II, 59, 71 f., 200, and dis-
 cussed, II, 63-68; popularity of, II,
 326 f., 348; referred to, in Q, I, 67,
 93, 109, 188, 284, 315, 318; the
 rival poets compose, II, 282; the
 sonnets derived from, I, 6, 245 f.,
 320, II, 72, 154, 241; Steevens on,
 II, 337 f.; text authorized by Sh.,
 II, 3, 6, 8 f., 23, 42, 384; transla-
 tions of, II, 378, 396, 398; *Willobie*
 and, II, 306 f., 312. *See* Adonis
 verb-form, Sh.'s archaic, I, 24, 111 f.,
 117. *See* plural
Verbum, II, 397
 Vere, Anne Cecil de, Countess of
 Oxford, II, 275 f.
 Vere, Bridget de, Lady, II, 57, 206,
 210
 Vere, Edward de, seventeenth Earl of
 Oxford, II, 210; *alias* Sh., II, 18,
 43 n., 45 f., 52, 83 f., 107 f., 161,
 165, 175, 184, 195, 218 f., 230,
 275 f., 282; his sons (by Queen
 Elizabeth), II, 165, 184, 230, (by
 Vavasour), II, 230, (by a Western
 Flower), II, 275 f., the friend; son-

- nets to, II, 178, 290; *Willobie* and, II, 312 f.
 Vere, Elizabeth de, Lady, II, 56, 193, 195, 210, 212
 Vere, Elizabeth Trentham de, Countess of Oxford, II, 175, 230; the dark woman, II, 275 f., and Avisa, II, 312 f.
 Vere, Frances de, Lady, II, 209
 Vere, Henry de, eighteenth Earl of Oxford, II, 313; dubious parentage of, II, 276; the friend, II, 230
 Verity, A. W., I, 15, 18, 25, 27-30, 33, 38, 45 f., 48, 52, 58, 62, 64, 68, 79, 90, 93, *et passim*, II, 80, 143, 170, 198, 263, 285, 343 n.
 Verlaine, Paul, II, 423
 vermilion, deep, I, 241 f., II, 330
 Vernon, Elizabeth: *see* Wriothsesley
 Vernon, John, of Hodnet, II, 56
 Vervins, France, peace of, I, 264 f.
 Verwey, Albert, II, 395
 Vesalius, Andreas, I, 193
 vial, make sweet some, I, 19
 Vianey, Joseph, II, 126
 Viëtor, Wilhelm, I, 59, 99
 Vienna, Austria, Sh. visits, I, 123
 Viereck, G. S., II, 184, 224 n.
 view, despite of, I, 360 f.; mistake my, I, 381 f.
 Vigny, Alfred de, II, 244 n.
 vildest (= vilest), I, 186
 Villemain, A. F., II, 389
 Villon, François, I, 334
 vinegar, or eisel, I, 281 f.
 Vinje, Aasmund, II, 396 n.
 violet past prime, I, 32 f.
 Virgil, I, 51, 256, 335, II, 131, 233, 278, 288
 virginals, the dark woman plays the, I, 326 ff., II, 267, 269
 Virginia Company, Hervey and the, II, 220. *See* Merchant Venturers
 virtuous lie, I, 25, 187
 Vischer, F. T., I, 86, 175, 280, 371, II, 150, 233, 387
 vituperative sonnets, I, 300, 351, II, 124, 126, 254
 Vivian, Percival, I, 245, II, 326
 Vizetelly, E. A., II, 266
 Voegel, Ernst, I, 32, 116, 175, 334, 354, II, 126 n., 425
 voices, two, Sh.'s, II, 48 f.
 Voigt, Edmund, I, 17, 21
 Vondel, Joost van den, II, 395
 votary, fairest, I, 396
 vulgar paper, every, I, 109; vulgar scandal, I, 283 (cf. 280); vulgar thief, every, I, 132, II, 203
 W., *alias* Sh., II, 50
 W., J. D., II, 373
 Wachler, Ludwig, II, 383
 Waddington, Samuel, II, 363
 "Wagner, Emil": *see* Walesrode
 Wagner, Philip, II, 208 n.
 Wailly, Léon de, II, 187, 233, 256, 389
 wake (= sit up for revelry), I, 163 f.
 Wakeman, Robert, II, 312
 wakened hate, your, I, 296 f.
 Waldron, Francis, I, 105
 Walesrode, L. R. ("Emil Wagner"), I, 273, II, 187, 383
 Walker, Alice, I, 143, 327, 348
 Walker, George, II, 323
 Walker, Henry, as Mr. W. H., II, 223
 Walker, J., II, 40
 Walker, J. C., II, 340
 Walker, W. S., I, 24, 30, 39, 52, 59, 90 ff., 95, 103, 121, 124 ff., 142, 160, 165, 170, 172, 175, 204, 206, 208, 217, 233 f., 242, 244, 249, 252, 255, 258, 271, 281, 293, 295, 302 ff., 319, 323 f., 336, 338, 347, 349, 351, 362, 365, 367, 378 f., 381, 387 f., 390 f.
 Waller, A. R., I, 327
 Waller, Edmund, I, 327
 Walpole Society, II, 192, 219 n.
 Walsh, C. M., I, 59, 76, 145, 148, 174, 201, 218, 228, 234, 250, 302, 330, 381, II, 9 f., 179, 181, 185, 203 n., 231, 234, 291; rearranges the sonnets, I, 229, 331, II, 97 f., 112
 Walsh, William, II, 331
 Walsingham, Francis, Sir, II, 284
 Walter, James, II, 258
 Walters, Cuming, II, 152, 171, 215
 wanhope, time's, I, 160
 Wanschura, Karl, II, 164 f., 275
 wanton burden, I, 239 f.
 wantonly (= playfully), I, 144 f.
 wantonness, thy fault is, I, 237
 Warburton, William, Bishop, II, 134, 331 f., 334
 ward, bosom's, I, 340
 Ward, A. W., Sir, II, 203, 263 n.
 Ward, B. M., I, 265, 267

- Ward, B. R., II, 107, 161, 174, 218 f., 260 n.
 Ward, C. A., II, 216
 Ward, Ida C., II, 376 n.
 Ward, John, I, 99
 Warner, G. F., II, 54
 Warner, William, part-author of Q, II, 48, 102
 warrantise of skill, I, 385
 warray, powers that thee, I, 377 f.
 Warren, C. T., I, 16, 37, 76, 127, 229, 303, 343, 352, 388
 Warren, John, II, 19, 24, 26
 Warton, Thomas, II, 331, 344 f., 356, 400
 Washington, George, II, 367
 Wassall, Grace, II, 314, 316 f., 319 f.
 wasted time, chronicle of, I, 260 f.
 wastes of time, go among the, I, 32 f., II, 351
 watch the clock, I, 154 f.
 watching, vext with, I, 381 f.
 water (=tears) for my stain, I, 273 f.
 Waterhouse, Edward, II, 181 f.
 Watkins, Richard, II, 5
 Watson, Thomas, I, 57, 69, 72, 128, 219, II, 84, 117, 124, 338, 349, 355, 363, 365, 386, 394; part-author of Q, II, 51; the rival poet, II, 293 n.
 Watts-Dunton, Theodore, I, 331
 wear this world out, I, 147, 151
 weather, Sh.'s reference to the, I, 18, 39
 Webb, T. E., I, 371
 Weber, Ludwig, II, 387
 Webster, John, I, 187, II, 430
 wedding present, Q a, for Hall, II, 218 f., for Hervey, II, 220 f.
 Wedmore, —, conjecture by, I, 69
 weed (=garment), I, 10 f.; basest weed, I, 233 ff.; noted weed, in a, I, 196 f.
 weeds among weeds, I, 311 f.; rank smell of weeds, I, 181 f.
 Weever, John, I, 371
 weighs (=cares for), I, 271 f.
 weight, to bear that, in me, I, 136
 Weinberger, Jaromir, II, 314
 Weiser, Karl, II, 386
 Welby, T. E., II, 353
 well-contented day, my, I, 92
 Wellesley, Henry, I, 393
 Wells, Somersetshire, I, 185, 397
 Wells, Evelyn K., I, 33
 Wells, H. W., I, 274, 392, II, 43, 72, 149, 430 f.
 well-tuned sounds, I, 23, II, 329
 Welshwoman, the dark woman a, II, 267
 Wendell, Barrett, II, 254, 338
 Werckmeister, Wilhelm, II, 174
 were't aught, I, 315 f.
 west, stealing to, I, 95, 97
 Westermanns *illustrierte . . . Monatshefte*, II, 261
 Western Antiquary, II, 263 n.
 Western Flower, Little, Oxford's ("Sh.'s") mistress, II, 275 f.
 Western Monthly Review, II, 389 n.
 Westfall, Alfred van R., II, 34, 36, 40, 368, 373 f.
 Westminster Review, II, 141, 289, 373
 Whall, W. B., I, 204
 what (=why), I, 356
 Whateley, Anne, *alias* Sh., II, 46, 227 f.
 when as (=when), I, 134
 where (=to the place where), I, 123 f.; (=whence), I, 197; (=whereas), I, 41 f.; (=whether), I, 158 f.
 Whetstone, George, I, 84
 which (=who), I, 90 f.
 Whipper of the Satire, I, 345
 White, B. and J., II, 40
 White, E. J., I, 102, 128
 White, F. A., II, 213 f.
 White, H., II, 339, 344 n.
 White, R. G., I, 59, 166, 196, 206, 234, 279, 287 f., 317, 320, 323 f., 387, II, 88, 138 ff., 166, 169, 197, 222, 231, 248, 277 f., 293, 374 f.
 White, T. W., II, 44, 228, 274
 White, W. A., II, 2
 Whitgift, John, Archbishop, II, 46, 192
 Whitman, Walt, II, 375
 Whitney, Geoffrey, I, 172
 who (=which), I, 65, 67, 118, 361, 372 f.
 Whorlow, H., I, 123 f.
 Who's Who in American Jewry, II, 399
 Whyte, Rowland, II, 205 f., 210 f.
 Wickham, Harvey, II, 276
 wide, go, I, 358 f.
 widow's eye, wet a, I, 26
 Wietfeld, Albert, I, 173, II, 66
 wights, fairest, I, 260 f.
 wigs, Sh. on, I, 180

- Wigston, W. F. C., II, 158, 214 f., 272
 Wilde, Oscar, I, 165, 232, II, 181-184, 225, 234, 238, 267, 282, 304 n., 367
 Wilder, Charlotte F., II, 244 n.
 wilful slow, I, 137, 139
 wilfully (=freely), I, 204 f.
 Wilhelm Hohenzollern, Kaiser, II, 230
 Wilkes, George, I, 106, 220
 Wilkins, E. H., I, 174
 Wilkinson, Edward, I, 14
 will (=carnal desire), I, 342, 350; (=sexual organs), I, 346 f.
 Will, personal name, in the sonnets, I, 155, 342, 344-350, 366 f., II, 7, 9 n., 181, 189 f., 201, 204, 214 f., 230, 232, 242, 271, 282, 431, means Sidney, II, 45; Will to boot, I, 344, 347
 Willard, O. M., II, 64 n.
 Willcock, Gladys D., I, 143, 327, 347
 William Himself (Sh.), as W. H., II, 214 ff., 224
 William the Conqueror, I, 159
 Williams, Charles, II, 266 n.
 Williams, Frayne, II, 11, 72, 208, 248, 271, 313
 Williams, J. D. E., I, 73
 Williams, R. F., II, 196 n.
 Williams, Richard, S. J., I, 264
 Willis, I., II, 319, 322, 324
 Willmott, R. A., II, 138
Willobie His Avis, II, 58, 269 f.; discussed, II, 295-313
 Willobie (Willoughby), Henry, the elder, II, 303
 Willobie (Willoughby), Henry, the younger, as W. H. or the friend, II, 223, 295-313
 Willobie (Willoughby), Thomas, II, 299
 Willoughby, —, Sh.'s rival, I, 346
 wills, in their, I, 304 ff.
 willy (=poet), I, 345; (=penis), I, 346 f.
 Willy, pleasant, Spenser's, II, 45
 Wilson, Christopher, II, 315
 Wilson, E. C., I, 335
 Wilson, F. P., I, 82
 Wilson, George, I, 246
 Wilson, J. D., I, 210, II, 8, 10, 49 f., 60 f., 103 f., 193, 221, 310 n.
 Wilson, John ("Christopher North"), II, 134. *See* "Pudor"
 Wilson, Katharine M., II, 215, 254
 Wilson, Mona, I, 149
 Wilson, Thomas, publisher, II, 40
 Wilson, Thomas, *Rhetoric*, II, 124, 192
 Wilson, Violet A., II, 263 n.
Wily Beguiled, I, 132
 wind, mounted on the, I, 137 f.
 Windet, John, II, 295, 299 n., 301
 Windle, Catharine F. A., II, 163
 windows of thine age, I, 12, 14
 wine, Q deals with, II, 83, 160 f., 273, 284
 wing, learned's, I, 201 f.
 winged speed, in, I, 137 f.
 wink, when most I, I, 121; wink with fulness, I, 152
 Winstanley, William, II, 330
 winter, full of care, I, 152 f.; hideous, I, 17 f.
 Winterich, J. T., II, 2 n.
Winter's Tale, I, 21, 61, 252, II, 251; parallels with the sonnets, II, 65
 wires, hairs be, I, 333 ff., II, 243, 261, 264
 Wisconsin, University of, *Sh. Studies*, I, 126, II, 66
 wisdom, celestial, the friend as, II, 228
Wisdom of Doctor Dodypoll, I, 224
 wish (=sensual love), I, 45
 Wither, George, II, 141 n., 198, 215
 witness not my wit, to, I, 75 f.
 wits, five, I, 360 f.; wits of former days, I, 158 f.
Wit's Recreations, I, 246
 Wittenberg, Germany (*q. v.*), Sh. visits, I, 123
 woe, conquered, I, 225; long since canceled, I, 86, 88; night of, I, 302 f.; other strains of, I, 225 f.
 wolf, stern, I, 237 f.
 Wolff, Gustav, II, 385, 387 f.
 Wolff, M. J., I, 36, 71, 128, 256, 393, II, 61, 72, 95, 99, 104, 127 f., 132, 150, 152 f., 190, 221, 231, 240, 245, 251, 254, 269, 282, 285, 290, 292, 311 n., 385 ff.
 Wolff, S. L., II, 175 f.
 Wollenberg, Robert, I, 375, II, 195
 woman, all the sonnets addressed to a, II, 136, 177, 224, 240, 243 f., 246-249, 259, or some of them, II, 167, 177, 242 f., 245-248, 277 f., 332 ff., 379. *See* addressees

- womb, making their, the tomb, I, 217 f.
- wombs, widowed, I, 239
- women, two or more, in the sonnets, II, 82, 88 ff., 92, 100, 159, 164, 177, 245-248, 252, 256-261, 273 f. *See* addressees
- wonder, composed, I, 158 f.
- Wood, Anthony, II, 201
- Wood, Clement, II, 419 f.
- Wood, H. H., I, 10
- Woodberry, G. E., II, 152, 176
- Woodward, Parker, II, 229, 274, 313 n.
- wooded of time, I, 183 f.
- Wootton, John, I, 334
- words, breath of, I, 214, 216
- Wordsworth, Dorothy, II, 347
- Wordsworth, William, I, 68, 71, 174, 268, II, 50, 134, 140, 142, 147, 155, 340-343, 345 ff., 349 f., 355-358, 369-373, 389, 392, 420
- Work in Progress*, II, 392
- work my mind, to, I, 78 f.
- world, breathers of this, I, 206 f.; vile, I, 186; wear out this, I, 147, 151; wise, I, 186
- world's due, eat the, I, 9
- world-without-end hour, I, 154 f.
- worms, vilest, I, 186
- worth, nothing, I, 187 f.
- worthless song, some, I, 248
- worth's, whose, unknown, I, 293, 295
- Wotton, Henry, Sir, II, 225
- wrack, mistress over, I, 319, 321
- wrackful siege, I, 172 f.
- Wright, John, II, 1 f., 5 f.
- Wright, Joseph, I, 347
- Wright, L. B., II, 311 f.
- Wright, Thomas, I, 265, 267, II, 211
- Wright, W. A.: *see* Clark (W. G.)
- wrinkles, Sh.'s preoccupation with, I, 53, 167, 198 f., 248 f., 271 f., II, 57, 178
- Wriothlesley, Elizabeth Vernon, Countess of Southampton, II, 56 f., 186, 189, 193, 267 n., 304; appears in Q, II, 88 ff., 93, 135 f., 140, 144, 157, 207, 258, 260
- Wriothlesley, Henry, second Earl of Southampton, II, 219
- Wriothlesley, Henry, third Earl of Southampton, as Sh.'s friend, dis-
- cussed, II, 186-195 (cf. 166-176, 208-213); Bacon-Sh.'s friend, II, 195; Bacon writes Q for, II, 164; Barnes and, II, 290; beauty and ugliness of, II, 187, 190 ff.; biographical details about, II, 56 f., 193 f., 212; Chapman and, II, 284-287, 291; circle of, writes Q, II, 51, 102; first meets Sh., II, 60; Fitton's lover, II, 266; Hervey and, II, 49, 111, 175, 219 ff.; homosexuality of, II, 25, 232-239; identified as Eno-barbus, II, 87, as "Hews," II, 185; Inez Circovitch and, II, 267 n.; Lucy Negro and, II, 272; Mrs. Davenant and, II, 270 f.; Nashe's patron, II, 268, 288; part-author of Q, II, 46 ff., 51, 185, and of Sh.'s plays, II, 45; Peele and, II, 291; Pembroke, his brother, II, 208 n., appears in Q with, II, 83, 88 f., 171, 206 ff., and dedicates Q to, II, 168, 175; portrait of, II, 394 n., given to Sh., I, 54; pronunciation of his name, I, 7 f., II, 194; references, supposed, to, I, 12, 46, 56, 58, 67, 75 f., 201, 208 f., 239, 255, 264, 266 f., 315, 320, 342, 346, 367, 392; rival poet, the, and, II, 277, *et passim*; Sh.'s rose, I, 7 f., 234, II, 9 n. (*see* Rose); sonnets dealing with, II, 145, 178 (*see* addressees), and sent to, in books, II, 82 f., 101; Tieck on, II, 380; various details about, II, 10, 55, 59 f., 70, 87, 91, 110, 135, 145, 157, 173 f., 213, 223, 230 ff., 244, 247, 249 n., 261, 268 f., 279, 281 f., 284, 289, 326, 393, 401; *Willobie* and, II, 303-313. *See* Wriothlesley (Elizabeth)
- Wriothlesley, Mary Browne, Countess of Southampton, II, 72, 210, 219 ff.
- Wülker, Richard, II, 152, 191, 199
- Wyatt, Thomas, Sir, I, 64, II, 118, 132, 255, 417. *See* *Tottel's*
- Wyld, H. C., I, 87, 99, 117, 373
- Wyndham, George, I, 7 f., 11, 28, 30, 33, 38, 45, 61, 69-73, 88, 90 f., 101, 107 f., 112, 114, 117, 124, 129, 134, 138, 145, 152 f., *et passim*, II, 7 ff., 57, 72 f., 80 f., 122, 131, 202, 241, 277, 280, 284 f., 294, 364
- X., part-author of Q, II, 48 f.

- Yale University, Sh. study in, II, 368 f.
 yard (=penis), I, 388
 y'are (=they're), I, 285
 Yate, Avis, II, 306
 Yates, Frances A., II, 131, 288, 310 n.
 ye (accusative), I, 119, 279, 282
 year, fleeting, I, 239; threescore year, I, 30 f.
Year's Work in English Studies, I, 264 f., II, 270, 309, 311
 Yeatman, J. P., II, 47, 253, 292
 Yiddish, the sonnets in, II, 399
 Yolland, Arthur, II, 397
 Yonge, Nicholas, II, 255
 York, Edmund, S. J., I, 264
you and *thou*, interchange of, discussed, I, 35 ff. See *thou*
 Young, Frances B., II, 205, 210 n., 212 n.
 Young, George, I, 155
 Young, H. McC., I, 8, 38, 119, 277, 303, 309, 320, 388, 392, II, 61, 84, 152, 194, 208, 239, 243
 Young, R., II, 329
 Young, W. P., I, 260
 youngly (=early in life), I, 30 f.
 your self, that you were, I, 36 f.
Zeitschrift für Aesthetik, II, 235
 Zéndegui, Gabriel de, II, 397
Zepheria, I, 76, 127
 Zillman, L. J., II, 351 n.
 Zimmermann, Robert, I, 57, II, 177, 244, 383, 403
 Zinkgref (or Zinckgref), J. W., I, 393
 Zocco, Irene, II, 127, 394
 Zoltán, Vilmos, II, 397
Zukunft, II, 174

PHILLIPS ACADEMY



3 1867 00044 4542

DATE DUE

Apr 20 2012

59500

822.3

Shakespeare

S5A✓

v.25

~~NOT FOR CIRCULATION~~

A New Variorum
Edition

